

THE

SATURDAY REVIEW

OF

POLITICS, LITERATURE, SCIENCE, AND ART.

No. 992, Vol. 38.

October 31, 1874.

[Registered for
Transmission abroad.]

Price 6d.

THE GOVERNMENT OF LONDON.

MR. CROSS exercised a sound discretion in withholding all expression of opinion on the Municipality of London Bill. Lord ELCHO would perhaps have been prudent if he had as carefully abstained from the use of argument or illustration. If he really thinks it strange that the City Corporation should view the Bill with distrust, and if he would as soon have expected VICTOR EMMANUEL to oppose the unity of Italy, he must have appreciated but imperfectly the tendency of the Municipal Bill and the history of Italian liberation. The King of SARDINIA largely extended his dominions by becoming King of ITALY. The dominions of the Lord Mayor are also to be enlarged, but he and his successors will no longer reign. Major LYON informed the HOME SECRETARY that the Metropolitan Board contained too many vestrymen; but the same class will rule London under the provisions of the Bill, by the name of members of the Municipal Council. The main issue is too important to be decided by a single Minister, who has at this time of year had no opportunity of consulting his colleagues. Attempts will probably be made to learn the intentions of Ministers when they dine on the 9th of November with a Lord Mayor who may possibly be doomed to extinction. Mr. DISRAELI is fortunately equal to the task of making an explicit statement which will convey no kind of information either to the Corporation or to their enemies. The deputation was in itself respectable, though there is no reason to suppose that it represented the opinions of the metropolitan community. The promoters of the movement have, with commendable fairness, embodied their wishes in the form of a Bill. As Mr. BEAL remarked to Mr. CROSS, the measure is simple, consisting practically in an extension to London of the provisions of the Municipal Corporation Act.

The Municipality of London Bill is carefully drawn, and it expresses with sufficient accuracy the views of the promoters. The question is one of general policy; and the details of course admit of alteration. If it is desirable that the metropolis shall be governed by an assembly directly elected by the ratepayers, there can be no insurmountable difficulty in arranging the machinery of election. The most objectionable part of the Bill, consisting in the transfer to the Corporation of the election of civic Judges and the control of the police, may probably have been inserted as an extreme claim to be afterwards abandoned or compromised. When the Crown appoints the Recorder of the pettiest borough, it would be anomalous to confer on a Town Council the appointment of the Recorder of London, or even of the Common Serjeant. It is true that the Recorder is at present appointed by the Corporation; but, if the Legislature determines to extend to London the provisions of the Municipal Corporation Act, there will no longer be any reason for preserving one isolated fragment of ancient customs which are in other respects abolished. It would be idle to expect that a numerous body representing popular suffrage will feel the responsibility which has been traditionally cultivated by the City Corporation. The Bill oddly provides that the election of Recorder shall be subject to the approval of the QUEEN, but that the election of the Common Serjeant shall be absolute. A veto is the most awkward form of control; and probably there will, in the event of a change, be little difference of opinion as to the expediency of vesting the judicial patronage of London in the QUEEN. The framers of the Bill have properly provided for the appointment of stipendiary magistrates in the City, in place of the Aldermen who will prac-

tically have ceased to exist. A criminal judge of high rank ought not to owe his promotion to popular favour.

The control of the police ought undoubtedly to be retained by the Government. It is true that the City Corporation has a police of its own which is equal to the Metropolitan Police in discipline and efficiency, though some inconvenience arises from a divided jurisdiction; but the Corporation of London is a responsible body, proud of its character, tenacious of its dignity, and bound to good behaviour in modern times by the insecurity of its position. Above all, the City Police is but a fraction of the entire force; and its numbers could never render it dangerous to public safety. The proposed Municipal Council will reflect the feelings of a constituency of whom the majority will belong to a class which may both grudge the expense of the police, and object in some cases to the employment of the force for the preservation of order. Mr. BEALES might not improbably have been a leading member of the Municipal Council or even Chairman of the Police Committee when his followers pulled down the Hyde Park railings. In times of sedition and riot it would be extremely inconvenient that the police should be at the disposal of a body which might perhaps be disaffected. In the worst days of municipal administration in New York, the Legislature of the State found it necessary to withdraw the control of the police from the City authorities. It may be hoped that even under a Municipal Corporation London will not sink to the level of New York, but it is certain that the wealth and cultivation of the metropolis will be practically unrepresented in the Council. It is a matter of Imperial concern that Parliament and the Government should not depend for protection on a force administered by the nominees of the metropolitan population. London belongs to the nation as well as to its small shopkeepers and artisans, and it would not be practicable to transfer the seat of legislation, as in New York and some other American States, to a provincial town beyond the reach of metropolitan democracy.

The promoters of the Bill deserve credit for the ingenious fiction by which they apparently perpetuate the ancient Corporation which they really intend to abolish. The Corporation is to retain all its titles and all its property, except that it will be not the same, but an entirely different body. The Municipal Council, which will for all purposes be supreme, is to contain two hundred members, of whom twenty will represent the City. Nine-tenths of the power of the present Corporation and its constituents will be transferred to new holders, who may at their pleasure deprive the unhappy citizens of all control over the municipal funds. The proportion allowed to the City is ridiculously insufficient, except on the assumption that all rights and powers ought to be distributed in proportion to the numbers of the resident population. The framers of the Bill take notice only of the small tradesmen, the caretakers, and the miscellaneous members of the humble class who sleep in the City. In the daytime the population is swelled by an additional half-million, and nearly the whole of the financial and commercial business of London is transacted within its limits. The citizens may perhaps be deprived of their privileges by the paramount authority of Parliament, but they certainly will not be hoodwinked by Mr. BEAL and his allies. It is nothing to them that the titular dignity of Alderman is to be retained, while the functions of the Court of Aldermen and of its members are summarily abolished. The Lord Mayor and the Aldermen will, after the passing of the Bill, no longer have any connexion with the City, nor is it necessary that any one

of their number should himself be a citizen. To use an American version of Mr. BEAL's phrase, the Corporation will have been amplified and developed off the face of the City.

The scheme is in some respects plausible; and it would be rash to assert that it may not possibly produce some kind of public benefit; but it is always necessary to beware when all men speak well of a measure, or listen in silence to its praises. In some important respects the incorporation of the metropolis is wholly without a precedent. No population of half the magnitude has ever been governed by a single elected assembly; nor has English legislation in a single instance sanctioned the transfer of an enormous property from one community to another. Finsbury, Marylebone, the Tower Hamlets, and Westminster have at present no more right to the property of the City than if they were situated in Devonshire or Yorkshire. It is now proposed by the clauses of a single Bill to take many thousands a year from the owners, and to give them without consideration to the inhabitants of the neighbouring districts. If the Bill becomes law, the citizens of London will no longer in their collective capacity have a shilling of their own; and it is but a minor grievance that they will only control in the proportion of one to ten the expenditure of the taxes which will be levied by votes of the majority in the Council. The able draftsmen who have prepared the Bill have apparently been unable to devise a recital in the preamble which might have purported to justify a gigantic confiscation. At present London is at least as well governed as any great town in the civilized world. Under a Municipal Corporation experience alone will show whether it can be governed with efficiency and safety.

GERMANY.

THE Emperor WILLIAM has opened the Session of the German Parliament with a speech which sufficiently indicates the exceptional position he holds among European sovereigns. He has a Parliament to address, and has thus to bring the more important features of his policy to the notice of the world; whereas his neighbour the CZAR does what he pleases, without any one knowing what he is doing or going to do. The German EMPEROR speaks in the name of a nation powerful, triumphant, and free from pecuniary embarrassment; and is thus distinguished from the rulers of Austria, France, and Italy. He can announce that a number of measures, all of the highest importance and all carefully prepared, will be brought forward in the same Session with a reasonable prospect of carrying them; and this is what no English Ministry could advise the QUEEN to do without incurring the risk of ignominious failure. The military system of Germany is to be recast; and at the same time, the gigantic task of establishing one judicial system and one code of laws throughout the German Empire is to be taken in hand. More men to serve, and more money to spend, is the demand of those who wield the huge military system which has won Germany so much, and is now to be perfected so that she may keep what she has won. Germans are so accustomed to look to the State as directing them, embodying their wishes, and measuring their needs, that there might perhaps in any case have been no great difficulty in persuading the representatives of the nation to give the Government the men and the money it needs for military purposes. But, fortunately for the EMPEROR and his Ministers, he has, at the crisis when this demand is made, found the best and most useful allies he could wish for in the conductors of a large section of the French press. They think it prudent to irritate Germany by the expression of constant suspicions and unwavering enmity, and so bring home to the German mind the necessity of taking in time of peace every possible precaution against disaster in war. The EMPEROR could safely say that he desired nothing but peace, and that his Government would not take any notice of French hostility until it proceeded from words to deeds. The desire of the German nation for peace is perfectly sincere, and there is as little as possible in Germany of the passion for mere military glory. Those, too, who have got all they want in the world are always ready to cry out that to leave things as they are, and to avoid all foolish quarrelling, is the golden rule for men; but with France on one side and Russia on the other, Germany feels much anxiety, and knows that she cannot

afford to let the moment come when she could be taken off her guard. To belong to such a State in such a position would not seem very desirable to most Englishmen; but it is only fair to view the German system of managing public affairs on its more attractive as well as on its less attractive side. England is the country of individual effort, of free criticism, of half measures, of eternal compromise or postponement. For years we have been talking of a Code, and in a desultory way we have spent a little money and a little time in seeing whether a Code would suit us, until at last all this faint talk has dwindled into Lord MONCREIFF's ironical suggestion that the real thing to do is to get two amateurs to codify any two of the easiest parts of law they please, and see whether any one will take any notice of their production. The Germans go to work very differently. They set the best lawyers they can get to draft a Code; they submit this draft to representatives of the different classes affected; the Government takes up the result, and submits it as a whole to Parliament. Social Science Congresses fade away entirely out of such a process, but then, on the other hand, a Code is made.

The foolish and wicked lad who attempted to assassinate Prince BISMARCK is now on his trial, and there is no kind of dispute as to the fact that he fired at the PRINCE meaning to kill him, and very nearly succeeded. He thought Prince BISMARCK habitually wore a coat of mail, and that he must therefore fire at the head; he put two bullets into his pistol to make quite sure, and fired when he was separated from the PRINCE by the space of only a step and a half. The proceedings in a criminal trial as conducted in our country always seem strange to those accustomed to a different system, and Germans no doubt would find something or other a little ridiculous, if they could ever see a joke, in our mode of trying offenders. We in our turn may be amused at their conception of what it is necessary to state and to prove so that guilt may be brought home to a person accused under such circumstances as KULLMANN. According to the custom in force generally on the Continent, the prosecution thinks it proper to paint and blacken all the past life of the supposed criminal. From his youth upwards KULLMANN is stated to have been revengeful and irreligious. He had indeed attached sufficient value to religion to become a member of a Roman Catholic Society. But then he had, according to the prosecution, a secret and carnal object in this. It is probable, the indictment asserts, that he joined the Society in order to procure cheap and good cigars. We are lost in wonder and delight at this suggestion. So this is the way that the crafty Jesuits work! Heaven and good tobacco is the attractive programme they offer to their votaries. Fancy Mr. NEWDEGATE's consternation when he finds that, wide awake as he is, he has tried all these years and never found out the real secret of his enemies. With what a jealous eye he will watch the contents of Lord RUPON's cigar case if he has ever an opportunity of inspecting it. And then the prosecution has the grandest ideas as to what it will prove, so that it may be known how diligent it has been and how beautifully the case has been got up. We learn that a landscape gardener was called to prove that a pistol with two bullets in it was heavily charged. Why was not a butcher called to prove that the friction of the air will not arrest the progress of a ball travelling over a distance of a yard and a half? Then there was a physician who quoted SCHILLER's *Wallenstein*, and proved that KULLMANN's mind was free. But this seems rather dangerous ground, as it might provoke the defence to go into the character of HAMLET. The Bavarians are evidently on their mettle, and are determined to demonstrate that they know how to establish the guilt of an assassin as well as people who are thought greater and wiser. Let us hope that they will succeed, and that they may persuade the great CHANCELLOR that he is as safe at Kissingen as anywhere else.

Count ARNIM has been released from prison, and various interpretations are put upon the event according to the wishes and interests of the interpreters. The solemn official account is that he has been released because his health was so bad that the Government had pity on him. The modified semi-official account is that he has been released because, as all the facts are established, he can now do no harm if he is set at liberty. The account of Count ARNIM's friends is that he has been released because the case of the prosecution has utterly broken down. The whole story of his official conduct and of the treatment he has received is the subject of endless gossip at

Berlin, and newspaper Correspondents send to England the most varying pictures of what has happened, according as the last idle talk they have had has pointed in one way or the other. Fortunately we have at last something better than mere gossip to go upon, if the letters that are said to have passed between the present MINISTER for FOREIGN AFFAIRS and Count ARNIM a month or two ago are genuine. The Minister asked for the missing documents, and the COUNT replied that he was no longer in the diplomatic service, and if the Minister wanted to get them he must bring a civil action for them. The Minister replied that the COUNT was still in the diplomatic service, as he was drawing his pension, and had never received the EMPEROR'S permission to retire, and that it was not a civil action, but criminal proceedings, to which the COUNT was exposed if he persisted in his refusal to give the documents up. The COUNT answered that he would not give them up, that he had nothing to do with the diplomatic service, and that he would abide the judgment of a civil, or, if necessary, of a criminal, tribunal. The Minister on this set the requisite machinery for criminal proceedings in motion, and then the court of law acted in regard to Count ARNIM as it would have acted towards any one else. In one sense this is probably true. Supposing it had not been documents, but some simple article of value, like plate, that the COUNT had carried off when he had been entrusted with it by the State, the court would have done, we may suppose, just what it has done. It would, on *prima facie* evidence being submitted to it, have arrested him and had his house searched; and, technically, a piece of paper carried off is as much an article of value as a fork or a spoon. The question is thrown back; and we have to ask whether it was wise and fair in the MINISTER for FOREIGN AFFAIRS, knowing what the action of the courts would be, to treat the detention of Prince BISMARCK'S letters to Count ARNIM on the same footing as the abstraction of a spoon. There are two ways of answering this. In England we should have been inclined to hush such a thing up; we should not have believed that a nobleman who had filled high offices had meant to do anything very wrong when he refused to give up letters which it may be assumed he ought to have given up. We should not like to see such a man treated like a thief or a burglar. But then in England we consider an Ambassador rather as an individual than as part of a system. He is a nobleman who is willing to accept a mission. In Germany, on the other hand, there is a great system of State service, and every member of the service is bound rigidly by its rules, and is looked on as a part of a whole. To keep this organization together it is necessary to enforce discipline from top to bottom. Count ARNIM, if he abstracts documents, is exactly in the same position as a clerk who abstracts them. The Regulations of our army require an officer to be brought to a court-martial just as much as a private soldier if he is guilty of certain offences, and the civil service of Germany is organized on much the same basis as our military service. According to this view, the Minister was bound to prosecute Count ARNIM if under the same circumstances he would have prosecuted a clerk. This reasoning appears to have convinced many Germans who at first were inclined to think that Count ARNIM had been very harshly treated. But there are still many Germans who do not know exactly what to say when they hear this reasoning, but who think that really Count ARNIM is not at all like a clerk; and so their minds lean to his side, and, without exactly saying that he ought to have had favour shown him, they pick up all the gossip they can find in order to show that he has suffered unnecessary hardship.

THE TWO LAW OFFICERS.

TWO Law Officers, one of the late and one of the present Government, have been enlightening their constituents on current politics. One was discursive, the other concentrated. Sir HENRY JAMES reviewed for the benefit of Taunton the general position and prospects of the Liberal party; Sir JOHN HOLKER kept the attention of Preston exclusively fixed on the one vital and truly Conservative question of beer; and each was excellent in his way. The late Attorney-General attacked his enemies, advised his friends, and instructed his party in his usual graphic and sparkling style; and as to beer, it may be safely said that there never was such a very beery Law Officer as the present SOLICITOR-GENERAL. It cannot be denied that Sir

HENRY JAMES had something practical and definite to say to Liberals generally. His advice to them, in fact, amounted to this—Abuse the Conservatives through thick and thin, watch them as cats watch mice, avoid burning questions, and stick to Mr. GLADSTONE. He put this advice in every kind of shape, reiterated it, and illustrated it abundantly. A Taunton elector might well have said to himself that it was all very well saying that the Conservatives must be abused, but that he did not see how he was to begin. Sir HENRY JAMES came to his aid, and showed him how easy it is, if people did but understand the art, to abuse political enemies. There was, for instance, the Endowed School Bill of last Session. Of course any novice could make a little easy fun of the scrape into which the Government got, and of the strange way in which Mr. DISRAELI extricated himself from it. But an advanced practitioner sees how to go much further than this. He perceives that the Conservatives ought to be abused for the gross inconsistency they display. They pretend great reverence for the intentions of founders, and yet they refuse to see that the founders of many schools were distinctly Protestant persons, and that they would really have been delighted to extend the benefits of their institutions to such eminently Protestant people as the present Nonconformists. This is the kind of inconsistency for which any amount of abuse may be properly showered on the Conservatives. Certainly the abused Conservatives might reply that what they are asked to do is not to open the endowed schools to Protestant Nonconformists only, but also to those very Catholics whom the founders left their wealth to combat. But this is a small detail, and one of the sovereign maxims of genuine abuse is never to go into pettifoggish minutiae. Then the Conservatives are to be watched, and the question might be raised in what spirit and to what extent are they to be watched? Can they never be trusted to do the least thing right? Never, is the short and simple answer of Sir HENRY JAMES. They are so desperately perverse by nature that the trail of the serpent is to be found in the tiniest of their performances. They would be sure to shape even a Turnpike Bill so as to favour secretly some jobbing class, unless Liberals like Sir HENRY JAMES were ever reading between the lines of their dangerous and insidious phrases. But even the most abusive and watchful party wants a leader; and Sir HENRY JAMES emphatically warned Liberals generally that they had only one thing to do, and that is to cast themselves without reserve at the feet of Mr. GLADSTONE. Last Session there were painful discussions as to who was to replace Mr. GLADSTONE if he would insist on always staying in Wales and thinking of nothing but HOMER. There was even a bitter and audacious attack made on Mr. GLADSTONE by one of his late subordinates. Now Sir HENRY JAMES is very fond of Sir WILLIAM HARCOURT, and admires him very much. But what is the use of any Liberal going out to fight on his own behalf, and slashing friends as well as foes? The Greeks could do nothing while ACHILLES stayed in his tents; and the Liberals in their present distressing position cannot do nearly as much good by sallying out independently to emulate the renown and repeat the failures of AGAMEMNON as by uniting to coax their great leader to smite the Trojans, as he only can smite them, or, in Parliamentary language, "to fulfil the duties of the leader of a Liberal Opposition."

Important, however, as all these things are, there is one thing more important still. Burning questions must be deliberately and anxiously avoided. Abuse, and watching, and sticking to Mr. GLADSTONE will be all in vain if Liberals persist in taking up vague and wild schemes of change for which the country is not at all prepared. But then it must be owned that there is an extreme section of the Liberal party which is mad about such schemes, and threatens to withdraw its support from all Liberals who will not join it. What is to be done with such people? Sir HENRY JAMES has evidently thought carefully over a question which is a very interesting one to most Liberal members with a somewhat precarious seat. His answer is that the first thing is to have courage to refuse to be dictated to, and to lose an election rather than sacrifice reputation and conscience to win a passing popularity. And he is perfectly entitled to adopt this tone, as he gave a most creditable example of such courage during his severe fight in the autumn of last year, when he declined altogether to bow to the pretensions of a noisy clique, although the contest was so close that it seemed as if to offend this clique

might entail a defeat mortifying to him and damaging to the Government. But courage is not all that Sir HENRY JAMES has to offer—he has also ingenuity. He thinks he sees how burning questions may be made safe and comfortable. His plan is to try to convince Liberals of the more violent and impatient sort that their true policy is to wait. He is with them, but he is their kind and wise friend. Take, for example, such a subject as the extension of the county franchise. Theoretically, he is quite in favour of the change, but he invites too ardent partisans to reflect on the consequences of making the change too hastily. The agricultural population is densely ignorant and abjectly dependent. It would be the tool of the landlord and the employer. If a million more voters are added to the electoral body, there must be a general revision of the constituencies. An enlightened borough like Taunton, which now returns two Liberals, would be then made part of a huge constituency, which would inevitably return one Conservative. This is undeniably true, as the experience of France under the late Empire may show, for there the Liberalism of the towns was successfully crushed by swamping them in rural constituencies. Sir HENRY JAMES advises the people of Taunton to reply to agitators for the extension of the franchise that they are quite ready to be swamped, only that they prefer waiting until the constituency in which they are swamped is likely to be as Liberal as they are themselves. In the same way most of the hot coals can be taken, by a little judicious treatment, out of the burning question of Church disestablishment. To zealots who stir this question prematurely the right reply, according to Sir HENRY JAMES, is that how and when to act is a matter of policy, not of principle. Attack the Church now, and failure is unavoidable. Wait, give the Church plenty of rope, and she will hang herself to a certainty. Thus Liberals of all shades may be brought to work together in harmony. To the advanced section who wish to deal the Church a deathblow the moderate section will answer that this is really unnecessary, that they have begun paying out the rope, and the Church has begun to fit it round her neck. Why should good friends quarrel because a person they all want to get rid of is left to commit suicide instead of being murdered?

There is a kind of dreamy indolent pleasure in turning from such high and difficult and vexatious matters and getting away to the simple theme of Sir JOHN HOLKER and beer. The great want of the Licensed Victuallers has hitherto been the advocacy of some man in a respectable position who thoroughly and heartily believed in them, saw with their eyes, and reasoned after the fashion of the inmost working of their minds. Beer may be looked on in so many ways—as a temptation to evil, as the source of crime, as an instrument of innocent refreshment, as a necessity of the working-man, as the secret of British strength. To publicans these are all flowers of speech, ugly flowers or beautiful as may be, but still foolish decorations of rhetoric. To them beer is none of these things; it is an interest. They have put their money into the trade, and they want to live by it. That is their simple view, and at last they have got a live SOLICITOR-GENERAL to vow that it is his view too. The more beer that is sold the more Licensed Victuallers live in honourable and well-earned comfort. When it is remembered what a vast capital is engaged in the trade, what a number of attractive and even splendid establishments are thus opened to high and low through the length and breadth of the land, and how many numerous, interesting, and respectable families thrive on the profits, the publicans and Sir JOHN HOLKER can scarcely contain the modest pride which swells their exulting bosoms. There is, indeed, but one drawback to their happiness. They live in a world where everything good and great is misunderstood. One of the most dreadful pieces of injustice done to the publicans is the supposition that they wish people to get drunk. There could not be a more egregious fallacy. There is nothing that these high-minded men detest more than drunkenness. It cannot be any pleasure to them to have noisy, quarrelsome persons reeling about their premises, the police interfering, and their licences endangered. They wish nothing of the sort. All they ask is that the public which they exist to please will visit them and spend as much money at their establishments as is consistent with the purchaser's being able to walk away quietly afterwards and giving no trouble. Far from the publicans desiring to see drunkenness, a whole population just not drunk is their ideal. Nor is it to be supposed, as the SOLICITOR-

GENERAL points out, that the publicans have any objection to their customers elevating their moral nature. They do not say that there shall be nothing in life but beer, nothing to raise mankind, nothing to restrain the weak from passing the limits of sobriety. The SOLICITOR-GENERAL more especially has anxiously revolved the question—to which benevolent and philanthropic people like the Licensed Victuallers cannot be dead—how beer-drinkers are to be improved, enabled to judge accurately what they can really stand, and led to love decency and all virtue. The conclusion at which he has arrived is that the true way to effect this great end is to develop in the minds of beer-drinkers a concurrent passion for cricket and billiards. With cricket in the morning, billiards in the evening, and moderate liquid refreshment all the time, a beer-drinker may go to bed with the comfortable reflection that he has honestly done his best, and the beer-seller may take some gentle credit to himself for having opened up the possibility of such an existence to a fellow-man. Such is the picture—the very pleasing picture—which the SOLICITOR-GENERAL draws of the aims, the importance, and the usefulness of the great body with whom and for whom he speaks. Even his critics—for it is scarcely to be hoped that he will altogether escape criticism—must allow that he has rendered them an unquestionable service. The first thing in criticism is to understand what those criticized really think and mean, and now no impartial person can deny that at last he understands the very nature of Licensed Victuallers.

THE BRUSSELS CONFERENCE.

A VOLUMINOUS Supplement to the *London Gazette* of October 23 contains the discussions and the final Protocol of the Brussels Conference. At the first meeting the Delegates resolved that no conclusions except those which might be unanimously adopted should be recorded in the Protocols; but it was soon found that adherence to the rule would leave the records of the Conference a blank. Accordingly, the discussions have been published, and they are reproduced in the Supplement to the *Gazette*. Lord DERBY has probably exercised a sound discretion in leaving them in the original French, though it might be plausibly argued that papers which are worth publishing are also worth translating. Only the most curious and most industrious inquirers will study in detail conversations which had little practical result, although they were sometimes not wanting in animation. The substance of the debates is sufficiently stated in Sir A. HORSFORD'S Report, and it will excite little interest. The conduct of the English Delegate seems fully to have justified the choice of the Government, though it would have been difficult for an officer of intelligence and prudence to commit his country to any of the decisions of the Conference in the face of Lord DERBY'S repeated and explicit protests. The correspondence on the subject begins with a declaration that the QUEEN'S Government will neither discuss the rules of international law nor undertake any new obligations, and that they will not even send a delegate to the Conference except on a distinct understanding that nothing shall be said about maritime warfare. Their agent was expressly prohibited from agreeing to any resolution, except for the purpose of referring it to his Government. Finally Lord DERBY after the close of the Conference formally intimated to all the Governments which had been represented at Brussels that his Government does not endorse (*sic*) any of the conflicting opinions expressed at the Conference, or accept the Rules annexed to the Protocol. The Rules themselves make no change in the recognized usages of war; but it is as well to disclaim the authority of any Conference to modify by statutory legislation the common law of nations. After the experience of the Treaty of Washington and its results, no English Minister will for some time to come agree to newfangled rules which may be applied to the purposes of a litigious adversary.

As the greater part of the topics submitted to the Conference related to invasion, it may be hoped that the subject will in the future as in the past have little bearing on English interests. The representatives of the smaller Powers were not unnaturally alarmed by proposals on the part of Russia and Germany which seemed to limit the right of defence. General VOIGTS RHETZ, who took a principal part in the discussion, plausibly contended that it was for the interest of the weaker as well as of the stronger

party that war should on both sides be conducted regularly, and under proper authority; but Belgium, Holland, and Switzerland were well aware that invasions are necessarily conducted by regular armies, while a defence by popular levies can scarcely be regulated by immutable rules. It is admitted on all hands that some kind of military organization is necessary to entitle volunteer bands to the rights of belligerents; nor is it desirable to encourage isolated acts of violence against even an invading enemy. General VOIGTS RHETZ demanded only a visible badge in place of uniform, and that the troops should be commanded by some military or civil officer acting under instructions from head-quarters. In the Resolution as it was finally adopted the further provision was inserted that the population of a non-occupied territory which had taken up arms without having had time for organization should be regarded as belligerents if they conformed to the laws and usages of war. When the case arises, invaders and invaded will take equally little account of the opinions of the Brussels Conference. For their own sakes the commanders of volunteers will establish some kind of discipline, and, if possible, they will provide a substitute for a uniform. In April 1848 the Provisional Government of France reviewed in the Champs Elysées three or four hundred thousand armed men, of whom not a tenth part wore any kind of uniform. If an enemy had at that time marched upon Paris, it would have been evidently impossible to treat National Guards who might have been made prisoners as irregular marauders.

Some discussion arose on the definition of a fortress, and an attempt was made to draw a distinction between a town defended by detached forts and a place enclosed by a continuous circuit of wall. As might have been expected, the German Delegate declined to allow an exception which would in 1871 have secured Paris against the risk of bombardment. It was eventually declared that towns which are open and undefended are not liable to bombardment, and the Delegates might have added that no commanding officer would be likely to expend his ammunition on a town which offered no impediment to the entrance of his troops. A town or a village which is unfortunate enough to be included in a military position must of course incur the penalty of attack as well as of defence. The declaration that a town taken by storm ought not to be given up to plunder records a recent advance in the humanity of belligerents. Spies are hereafter, as at present, declared liable to be shot if they are caught, although they are not liable to any punishment if they are taken prisoners when they have accomplished their mission and rejoined the ranks of their own army. The original proposal of the Russian Government that inhabitants of an occupied territory giving information to their own Government should be treated as spies was expunged by unanimous consent. For other purposes it was found both expedient and difficult to define the precise meaning of occupation. General VOIGTS RHETZ was of opinion that a territory might be occupied by flying columns, and he denied the analogy of military occupation to maritime blockade. According to the original project, the inhabitants of occupied districts who should voluntarily rise against the invader were to be treated as criminals; but the Netherlands Delegate, while he admitted that an invader would sometimes treat insurgents with severity, "repudiated the idea of any Government contemplating delivering over in advance to the justice of the enemy those men who, from patriotic motives and at their own risk, expose themselves to all the dangers consequent on a rising." Baron LAMBERMONT of Belgium added that, if citizens were to be sacrificed for attempting to defend their country, "they need not find inscribed on the post at the foot of which they are to be shot, the Article of a Treaty signed by their own Government, which had in advance condemned them to death." If any English insurgent against a foreign enemy should find himself in that unhappy condition, the document inscribed on the post at the foot of which he is to be shot, ought also to record that Lord DERBY and his countrymen are not in the smallest degree bound by even the modified provisions which were included in the Protocol.

Private property is to be nominally respected, and it is with admirable vagueness provided that "the enemy will demand from local authorities or from the inhabitants only such payments and services as are connected with the necessities of war generally acknowledged in proportion to the resources of the country." NAPOLEON and

his Marshals exacted only such payments as were, in their judgment, connected with the necessities of war; and the result was that the inhabitants of the countries which they occupied generally bore the whole cost of the invading army, with a few millions for the private purses of the superior officers, and equal or greater contributions to the military treasury of the EMPEROR. When the Delegates came to the question of reprisals, the conventional deference which every State expressed for the wishes of any other State broke hopelessly down. As Sir ALFRED HORSFORD remarks, instances of severe reprisals were too recent to permit a dispassionate consideration of the question. The Russian Delegate could only express a too sanguine hope that "the mere mention in the Protocol that the Committee, after having endeavoured to regulate, to soften, and to restrain reprisals, has shrunk from the task before the general repugnance felt to the subject, will have a most serious moral bearing." It was not exactly from repugnance to reprisals that the Committee of Conference shrank from discussing the subject; but Baron JOMINI, who is the most courteous and conciliatory of diplomatists, deserves credit for extemporizing an excuse for inevitable failure. As no one is bound to conclusions which are in themselves for the most part unobjectionable and exempt from all suspicion of novelty, the Conference will have done no harm. The motives of the Emperor ALEXANDER in convoking the Conference were probably benevolent, and, if no progress has been made towards mitigating the evils of war, some moral effect may perhaps, as Baron JOMINI hopes, be produced by the general acknowledgment that, although the sole object of war is to hurt and distress the adverse belligerent, yet the infliction of the greatest possible pain and misery is not in itself a desirable object.

SOCIALIST AGITATORS.

WHEN the Suffolk farmers first accepted the challenge of the Labourers' Trades Union, volunteer advisers told them that they were mad, or exhorted them to increase the scanty wages of their men, instead of driving them to despair. The agitation which was checked by the firmness of the farmers in the Eastern Counties has lately been revived in Somersetshire with less concealment of its real purpose. Noisy demagogues and revolutionary pedants now demand on behalf of farm-labourers, not an addition to their wages, but a redistribution of landed property. A Dissenting preacher who presided at a late meeting at Wellington quoted with professional familiarity the precedent of the Mosaic year of jubilee as applicable to the soil of England. As landed property was certainly hereditary among the Israelites, they can scarcely have conformed in practice to the injunction which certainly seems to be found in their law; but during the Reign of Terror a Jacobin judge is said to have decided an action of ejectment in favour of the plaintiff on the express ground that the defendant had proved the undisputed possession of the land by his ancestors during several generations. The Court ruled that the owner had held the land long enough; and that now it was the turn of the claimant. The Somersetshire preacher would act on the same principle with the apocryphal Jacobin in the story. It is not worth while to argue with a teacher who may or may not believe the doctrine which he at least thinks good enough for an ignorant audience. One of the advantages of a voluntary ecclesiastical system is total absence of responsibility. Even if farmers were otherwise likely to be convinced of the expediency of giving more than the market price for labour, they would see the impossibility of conciliating demagogues and dupes who claim a right neither to large wages nor to occupancy, but to the ownership of the land. The statistics which are commonly produced by agitators, though they may not be intelligible to labourers, probably produce an effect by the long array of figures. It is said that a hundred and fifty persons own half the soil of England; in which case their possessions must average considerably more than two hundred thousand acres. A hundred and fifty estates of such magnitude would not be easily enumerated in detail. It is next asserted that railways have added 800,000,000*l.* to the value of land in England, or 400,000,000*l.* to the property of the hundred and fifty monopolists. This unearned increment, as Mr. MILL called it, ought obviously to be confiscated, perhaps in an-

ticipation of the jubilee year which will transfer the residue to the defrauded labourer. In pursuance of the same mode of reasoning it might be shown that the increase in the value of investments and in the profits of trade which may be traced to the extension of population and industry belongs to anybody rather than to the actual holders. The funds are now worth thirty or forty per cent. more than in the early part of the century.

Mr. FRANCIS NEWMAN, in an argument for the equalization of the county and borough franchise, virtually recommended the labourers to use the suffrage, as soon as they obtained it, for purposes of spoliation and revenge. English Parliaments had, he assured them, always been hostile to the labourer, as was proved by the Acts which purported to establish a maximum of wages. It was unnecessary to remind the workmen that no such Acts had been passed or enforced for many generations; and it would perhaps have been superfluous as well as difficult to prove that modern Parliaments had exhibited any hostility to the poor. It is a favourite device of agitators to attribute to the objects of their denunciation all the offences which may at any former time have been committed, or said to have been committed, by the class to which they belong. Nobles were massacred during the French Revolution because, amongst other reasons, their enemies had invented a legend in which feudal lords were represented as having in the middle ages warmed their feet in the blood of their murdered vassals. Mr. NEWMAN, though he resembles in many respects the logical and philanthropic section of the Jacobins, has probably no wish to send landowners to the guillotine. He only explains to the Somersetshire labourers that down to the time of HENRY VIII. they were called landlords, and that at that date they became landowners by conquering the villeins, whom they sometimes hanged by a hundred at a time. Mr. NEWMAN adds that it is a happy incident of the present agitation that it has never been proposed to take property from the landlords. "What remedy is to be supplied is a matter for mature reflection." Possibly even the intellect of a discontented labourer may have suggested, with little need of reflection, that the remedy for unjust deprivation of property is to take it back again by force. If the villeins were, as Mr. NEWMAN asserts, conquered by the great lords, who thus dispossessed the peasantry from their holdings, the peasantry have only with the aid of the franchise to conquer the lords in turn, and so to recover their holdings. It is true that with few exceptions the landowners of the present day have neither conquered nor dispossessed anybody, except by the simple process of buying his land with the earnings of themselves or their predecessors. Historical politicians of the school of Mr. NEWMAN are always ready to visit the sins of the fathers, not only on their children, but on the assignees for valuable consideration of a long succession of previous purchasers from their children.

It may be well to recall attention to the professed purpose of Mr. NEWMAN's elaborate dissertation on landed property. Nothing can be more reasonable than to support a demand for the extension of the suffrage by an exposition of the political results which it is expected to produce. Mr. NEWMAN and the other speakers at the Wellington meeting are entitled to the credit of candour, if not of prudence, when they explain that the political power which they ask for the labourer is to be employed in expropriating the present owners of the land. It is true that some of the orators affect to disguise from others, and perhaps from themselves, the only intelligible meaning of their declamation; but they all concur in assuring the labourer that he has been unjustly dispossessed of the soil of which he is the rightful owner. The grievance can only be redressed by simple restoration. It is idle to speak of compensation to be paid by penniless claimants. In Prussia and in Russia, which are always invidiously held up for the imitation of English legislators, the peasantry were, before the modern changes in the law, already in possession of the land which they now possess; and it only remained to relieve them from the incidents of a servile tenure. In England small freeholders have been bought out, and small purchasers have been outbidden. The natural effect of freedom of trade in any commodity is to accumulate objects of luxury in the hands of the rich. If the Wellington doctrines of transfer were carried out in practice, some families would be found to have made the best of both the present and the feudal time. In every county names which indicate former ownership of the

land are to be found among the labouring class, while the neighbouring squire is probably the descendant of a trader whose ancestors may have been numbered among Mr. NEWMAN's dispossessed villeins. The extravagant proposals of demagogues in the rural districts will not be without incidental advantage, if their language induces politicians seriously to consider the project of extending household suffrage to county constituencies. Mr. GLADSTONE adopted the popular doctrine with characteristic levity; and Mr. DISRAELI has sometimes countenanced it with a not less characteristic affectation of confidence in the working class. Mr. GLADSTONE would perhaps not have menaced the stability of the Constitution if he had not happened at the moment to want an excuse for his conversion to the Ballot. Mr. DISRAELI believes that he proved his sagacity when he taught his party that it was for its interest to dig down to a stratum of voters which would, as he assured them, be Conservative. The tone of his speech on Mr. TREVELYAN's motion in the last Session indicated a disposition to repeat the experiment, if only he could ensure the assent of his colleagues and his party. The stratum in which the doctrines of Mr. NEWMAN and his friends have been deposited is not likely, when it is brought to the surface, to produce Conservative vegetation. The managers of the Union, the rural agitators, and the Socialist professors give Parliament fair warning of the objects to which they will direct the political energies of the enfranchised labourers. The landowners and the farmers are thoroughly aroused, and they will not readily forgive any attempt to place them at the mercy of the demagogues who expound their policy not only in mischievous speeches but in incendiary caricatures. If the owners of personalty connive at the confiscation of the land, they will be justly and inevitably punished by the application to their own possessions of Socialist principles.

NANA SAHIB.

IF it should turn out after all, as seems not improbable, that the NANA SAHIB who has been captured by SCINDIAH is not the real NANA, or at least that there is no certainty of his being so, there will be no reason to regret that the British Government has been thus conveniently relieved from a painful and embarrassing responsibility. It will be observed that the very positive assertions of the first telegram have been gradually toned down in subsequent communications. At first it was taken for granted that this man must necessarily be the NANA, and that there was no room for any sort of doubt on the subject. It now appears that all that can be said is that somebody has been seized on the assumption that he is NANA SAHIB, and that, while several persons who have seen him and who knew the NANA think he really is the man, others think he is not. It has been remarked that there is something singularly dramatic in the capture by a native prince, who has at the present moment special reasons for showing himself friendly to England, of another prince who has made himself the most notorious embodiment of hatred to our rule; but to some minds the striking poetical appropriateness of the incident may tend rather to confirm than to remove the doubts which have been suggested. The first report was that SCINDIAH had himself recognized the NANA and seized him with his own hand, and that the prisoner had immediately confessed his name. A later message tells us that the prisoner has repudiated his confession as having been obtained under the influence of hunger and drugs. We also learn that the doctors differ as to his age, some holding that he is under forty and others that he is over that age; that Dr. TRESSIDER, the Civil surgeon at Cawnpore during the Mutiny, who attended the NANA, and once performed an operation on his foot, fails to identify him; and that Colonel M. THOMPSON, who was also well acquainted with the NANA's appearance, though he sees a general likeness, including a scar on the forehead, does not feel sure that he is the right man. On the other hand, SCINDIAH adheres to his opinion; a nephew, and another man who is oddly described as "the father of the man who married the daughter of the NANA's adoptive father," have borne testimony on the same side; and certain Mahratta witnesses, not particularly specified, are said to have seen him after he was shaved and dressed, and to be confident of his identity. When there is such a conflict of opinion, it will certainly not be surprising if the prisoner should be ultimately released.

It would of course be hopeless for any one at a distance to attempt to solve a problem of this kind. We can only accept on trust the judgment of those who are supposed to be most capable of forming one. It is obvious, however, that the question is clearly not one to be determined by a mere numerical majority of witnesses, inasmuch as the testimony of a single thoroughly independent and competent witness might justly outweigh that of a score of others of a less trustworthy character. We have lately witnessed in our own country an instructive example of the liability of intelligent and conscientious witnesses to fall into strange confusion and inaccuracy in giving evidence on a question of personal resemblance when there has been a long interval during which the person to be identified has not been seen. It is now ten years since the NANA disappeared, and it may be presumed that his experiences during that time, if he is still alive, have left their mark upon his looks. There is no reason to suppose that SCINDIAH is capable of deliberately passing off a false NANA on the British Government as a means of paying court to it; but nothing is more likely than that it should be known that he would be glad if the NANA could be found, and that his dependents should endeavour to gratify his wish. It would appear that there is certainly a resemblance, and perhaps a strong resemblance, between the prisoner and NANA SAHIB. Indeed the man himself says that he was arrested on a similar suspicion in 1864, and acquitted. This acquittal, supposing the man to be the same, would of course prove nothing except that the authorities at that time did not feel certain that he was the NANA, and the second question of identity thus opened up would probably be at least as difficult to determine as the first. As the matter stands there would seem to be very little chance of the question being decided either one way or the other in such manner as to put an end to controversy. Some years ago a circumstantial account of the NANA's death from jungle fever was accepted at Calcutta as authentic. If the present presumed NANA were to be executed, there would be many people who would believe that the penalty had been inflicted on the wrong man, and that the real NANA was still alive.

Under these circumstances there can, we should think, be little doubt as to the course which the Government will pursue. If it is proved by overwhelming evidence that the NANA has actually been caught, there will, we suppose, be no alternative but to hang him, but it will certainly be a relief, and not a disappointment, if it should happen that the unwelcome captive cannot be identified. It is not surprising that SCINDIAH should take the view of the matter which would naturally present itself to the mind of a native prince. He would imagine that nothing could be more gratifying to the British Government than to get hold of its old enemy for the purposes of vengeance; and though he is said to have begged that the prisoner's life may be spared, he has probably done so with little expectation that this clemency will be displayed. Englishmen, however, have a different way of looking at such questions. It is true that some English journalists seized upon the first intimation of the capture as an excuse for raking up the horrible memories of Cawnpore, and gloating over the opportunity for revenge which has now offered; but, in striking this note, they strangely misrepresented the feelings of their countrymen. It would of course be absurd to waste any pity on the NANA. What he did is registered indelibly, and can never be forgotten; but the page is one on which Englishmen do not care to dwell. The terrible anguish of the hour has been softened by time into a mournful memory, and NANA SAHIB himself may be said to have taken his place among the shadows of history. If he is still alive, and actually in our hands, the law must take its course. But his execution, though due to the law, would be a miserable satisfaction to those whom he wronged. Our account with him has long ago been closed, and practically he may be regarded as having ceased to exist when the Mutiny was suppressed. If his life is further prolonged, it will be only on the same conditions as those on which he has enjoyed that doubtful boon during the last ten years. He can live only by renouncing everything that makes life worth having. He must skulk, and hide, and burrow like a hunted beast, knowing at every moment that his life is at the mercy of those who shelter him. It is true that the security he has hitherto enjoyed proves the connivance of friends, but there is no evidence that this connivance is general. Indeed, the very completeness with which the secret has been kept suggests

that it must have been known only to a few. To hang the NANA now would be almost like hanging a ghost, without having power to lay it. The official attestation of his death would not remove the doubts of sceptics as to the identity of the victim; and, on the other hand, even if he lived a little longer, his existence, as he must remain invisible, would be only a sort of legend. On the whole, it may be thought that it would have been just as well if SCINDIAH had held his hand. The most convenient issue of the affair will be the discovery that the captive is not the NANA, but only some unfortunate creature with an awkward resemblance to him.

FRANCE.

PRINCE NAPOLEON has again performed his favourite feat of posing as the democratic member of a despotic house. He has favoured the electors of the canton of Ajaccio with an exposition of the views which separate him from the other branch of his family, and which will continue to separate him from them until such time as a reconciliation promises to be convenient. It is well that cousins should dwell together in unity when one is in power, and the other finds the relationship profitable; but when both are, politically speaking, in exile, there may be an advantage in their appealing to supporters of different opinions. Prince NAPOLEON has discovered that the Napoleonic tradition has two sides to it. The Empire was at once a dictatorship and an emancipation. In the former character its mission was to secure in France and Europe the conquests of the Revolution. In the latter character its principal object was to give Prince NAPOLEON opportunities of distinguishing himself. The enfranchisement of Italy, the annexation of Nice and Savoy, the adoption of Free-trade, the Workmen's Commissions, and a project of decentralization which we hear of for the first time, were the results of a policy which Prince NAPOLEON recommended and with which Prince NAPOLEON associated himself. In so far as the Empire kept on good terms with its guardian angel all went well. Unfortunately the late EMPEROR did not always listen to these gentle promptings. There were other parts of his administration to which Prince NAPOLEON had to offer a strenuous, though, as it appeared to outside observers, a discriminating, opposition. He was the constant adversary of official candidature. He had no hand in the persecutions which made the Empire so many enemies. He resisted the wavering and fatal policy which led French troops to Mexico and Mentana. He was opposed to the war of 1870. Nothing that the late EMPEROR did against Prince NAPOLEON's wishes ever prospered. Nothing that he did under his advice ever failed.

Under these circumstances it was natural that when the EMPEROR died Prince NAPOLEON should have expected to be summoned to Chislehurst to be guide, philosopher, and friend to the PRINCE IMPERIAL. Instead of this, he found that his cousin remained in the hands of the same bad counsellors who had led his father to ruin. The Imperialist leaders, he says, dream only of reaction and proscription. They are no better than Legitimists, without the White Flag. They are the slaves of Clericalism abroad and at home. The system they desire to restore is the system of the BOURBONS. This last accusation seems a little unfair, for the BOURBONS, judging by the acts of their adherents since they have been in office, have done their best to restore the system of the Empire. Possibly, however, the object of bringing these charges is to impress the Legitimists with a conviction that there is a substantial likeness between them and the Bonapartists, and that they will consequently do well, when they have no candidate of their own, to give their votes to an Imperialist. There is no need to suspect Prince NAPOLEON of anything more than a qualified dislike of his cousin. He is probably equally willing to take advantage of him when he has the opportunity, and to do him a good turn whenever the doing of it involves no loss to himself. In this case, as he cannot hope to win over the Legitimists for himself, it may be as well if possible to secure their votes for the family. Meanwhile it is the PRINCE's business to catch Republican votes, and accordingly he winds up his address by an enumeration of the democratic reforms which he will introduce if ever he has the chance. Tranquillity at home and peace abroad, the work of 1789 carried on to perfection, a remodelling of laws and institutions in the interest of democracy, army reorganization, rearrangement of taxation so as to please the greatest number of taxpayers,

compulsory education, emancipation of communes, Free-trade, liberty of the press, and of association—in short, universal progress and amelioration will accompany Prince NAPOLEON wherever he goes. Here, again, no harm can come to the party from the waving of the democratic flag. Prince NAPOLEON is not a candidate for the throne. As he himself puts it, he has had "too intimate an acquaintance" with the grandeurs of power to have any personal ambition "left." As it might be more accurately expressed, he knows too well that succession to the Empire is beyond his reach to make himself unhappy because he cannot enjoy it. Consequently, if he should attract any votes in any constituency by means of this proclamation of his opinions, they must all go to the Imperialist candidate. If Prince NAPOLEON really has the accomplishment of these reforming intentions at heart, he can only carry them out under his cousin's rule. And, in the improbable event of any considerable number of French electors believing in the PRINCE's sincerity, the only obvious means of giving him the requisite opportunities will be to place him in the position of first Prince of the Blood. If, on the other hand, Republican ideas remain in the ascendant, and the PRINCE IMPERIAL is not recalled from England, it will be well for the BONAPARTE family that one of their number should be a candidate for such honours as the Republic will have to bestow. It is on the cards that Prince NAPOLEON, if he talks long enough about universal progress and amelioration, may some day become President in the Radical interest. How could he show a more disinterested regard for his country than by using his term of office to prepare the way for his cousin's restoration? There is not the least chance that the Imperialist party would ever accept Prince NAPOLEON himself as Emperor, and the certainty that he was giving up nothing would greatly sweeten this apparent act of self-denial.

It will be well if the dissensions which have broken out among the Republicans in connexion with the Oise election prove no more serious than the quarrel in the BONAPARTE family is likely to be. At present it seems not unlikely that the rivalry between M. ROUSSELLE and M. LEVAVASSEUR may end by letting in the Duke of MOUCHY. M. ROUSSELLE is willing to retire after the first ballot if M. LEVAVASSEUR gets more votes, but he insists on his right to be accepted as the sole Republican candidate if M. LEVAVASSEUR stands lowest on the poll. In theory this claim is perfectly reasonable. The Republican party is assumed to be divided as to which of its two candidates it would like to see returned, but to be united in the desire to see either of them returned in preference to the Duke of MOUCHY; and in this case the natural course is for the minority to withdraw their candidate in favour of the candidate of the majority. As a matter of fact, however, this is not at all a true description of the feelings of the Republicans. M. ROUSSELLE's partisans would like to see M. LEVAVASSEUR successful if the choice lay between him and the Duke of MOUCHY; but it is by no means clear that M. LEVAVASSEUR's partisans return the compliment. On the contrary, there is great reason to believe that, if M. LEVAVASSEUR were to withdraw after the first ballot, and M. ROUSSELLE and the Duke of MOUCHY were the only candidates in the field, a considerable number of M. LEVAVASSEUR's supporters would go over to the Duke of MOUCHY. It is difficult perhaps for M. ROUSSELLE to realize this fact, and it must be admitted that, so long as it remains a fact, the position of Radical candidates will be an unsatisfactory one. Inevitable self-sacrifice at the last moment, and the feeling that they have let in an adversary, are not a pleasant pair of alternatives to have to choose between. It is possible that, in order to keep alive their disinterestedness, the Radical candidates must occasionally be brought face to face with the consequences of an opposite line of conduct. The extreme Republicans have of late become very much more moderate than they used to be, and this improvement is in part attributable to their experience of the mischief which followed from the return of M. BARODET for Paris. If the Oise election ends in the return of the Duke of MOUCHY, they may learn from defeat the same lesson which they formerly learned from a victory which turned out to be more disastrous than any number of defeats. It will be a remarkable evidence of good sense if M. ROUSSELLE should, after all, retire in favour of M. LEVAVASSEUR; but if he does not, it will be some comfort to reasonable Republicans to reflect that future elections may be determined in their favour by a fresh demonstration that only an extremely Conservative Republic can possibly succeed in France.

IRRIGATION IN INDIA.

THE famine in Bengal has brought into new prominence the difficulties of irrigation, or, to speak more strictly, of paying for irrigation. Sir JOHN STRACHEY has lately described the financial result of the system at present in force, supposing it to be extended with that increased speed which seems now to be demanded by public opinion in India. "The cost of the works now in progress," he says, "or the construction of which has been sanctioned, can hardly involve us in serious difficulties; but the necessity for protecting the country against famine is so great that it is impossible to say that we ought to be satisfied with the moderate rate of progress which is being made." Sir JOHN STRACHEY does not question the assumption of the Indian Government that the returns from the works will not only cover the interest on the capital expended, but ultimately repay the capital itself. But though these calculations are correct, "they are only correct with this serious proviso, that a long time will commonly elapse before the anticipated results are obtained." In proportion as more canals are projected and those already in progress are pushed on more rapidly, this prospect becomes more alarming. The Government may afford to lay out small sums of money for some considerable time, but, as one province of India after another puts in its claim, the interest on the aggregate capital borrowed must become large enough to exercise a very disturbing influence on the Indian Budget. In the three years ending the 31st of December, 1871, the whole revenue of Orissa was spent upon canals, and unless the works themselves can be made to pay the interest on the cost of construction, the Government of India will be burdened with two millions of public debt and an annual payment of 90,000*l.* This is an example of what is done under the pressure of recent terror; and what the famine of 1866 was for Orissa the famine of 1874 will be for Bengal. It is true that a great part of Lower Bengal has an average rainfall which seems to make irrigation a luxury, but last year's experience has shown that a large average rainfall is not a guarantee against famine. If rain is wanting from the 1st of August to the 15th of September, it matters little how much may have fallen during the earlier part of the year. Besides this, the districts which suffered most from drought in 1873 lie outside this comparatively favoured zone, and have an average rainfall which makes irrigation a necessity to the prosperity, if not to the existence, of the people. Wherever this is the case, the Indian Government will be strongly pressed to make canals, not to mention that it will probably feel, with Sir JOHN STRACHEY, that it "is an absolute duty to the people which must be performed whether the financial risk be great or not." But the financial risk involved in pressing on irrigation works to the utmost possible extent amounts to a choice between bankruptcy and burdensome taxation, and in India burdensome taxation is a source of considerable suffering for the people, and of immense, and possibly dangerous, unpopularity for the Government. This is the difficulty which Indian financiers have now to meet. At present canals are paid for by loans, and if the people for whose benefit the canals have been made would use the water, the price they would pay for it would at least meet the interest on the capital borrowed. But as a matter of fact they do not use the water. The innate conservatism of the Indian peasant, says Dr. HUNTER, gives the canals no chance. He and his fathers have been accustomed to trust to the accidents of successive seasons, to rejoice when rain is abundant and the harvest bounteous, to lie down and die when the earth is dried up and the crops fail. No doubt where irrigation works exist he no longer gives himself up to despair. He turns in his extremity to the canals, and is glad to take the water which he has hitherto despised. But before he yields to this overpowering necessity he has probably been reduced to beggary, if not to starvation. The Land-tax will have to be remitted, relief works must be set up, and in the face of this state of affairs the Government will have to consider by what new tax to raise the interest on the irrigation loan for the years during which the canals lay absolutely unused.

Lord Mayo proposed to solve the problem how to pay for irrigation by levying a compulsory water-rate. The people who are directly benefited by the construction of canals are the people, he argued, who ought to pay for them. At present "everybody seems to desire irrigation, but many

"seem to desire that somebody else should pay for it." If these works are to be steadily gone on with they must be made self-supporting and independent. Without this they will be constantly liable to suspension in deference to some immediate necessity. It is only fair that the cultivators whose lands are improved, and whose lives are saved, by the presence of water in seasons of drought, should bear a burden which after all leaves them richer than it finds them. Sir JOHN STRACHEY maintains that, though Lord MAYO's proposal to levy a compulsory water-rate on the lands benefited by the canals has been misunderstood and misrepresented, it was thoroughly just and wise, and that on no other basis can any extensive system of irrigation be constructed. It is not easy indeed to deny this latter statement. The English taxpayer will certainly not make a present of the money to the Indian taxpayer, and all that can be safely and profitably got out of the Indian taxpayer is got out of him already. The Indian Government might conceivably shut its eyes to these two facts, and go on borrowing with no real hope of repaying either capital or interest, but it is practically impossible that such a policy should either find favour at Calcutta, or, even if it did, be sanctioned by the SECRETARY OF STATE. There is a school of Indian politicians who object to a compulsory water-rate, on the double ground that it would be oppressive in itself, and would end by giving the peasantry a distaste for irrigation which would go far to render the works useless. As regards the first plea, it seems to be disposed of by the conditions which Lord MAYO proposed to attach to the rate. On his plan it was not to be levied until the inhabitants had neglected to take the water for five years after it had been brought to their fields, and then only in places "where it can be proved that the cultivator's net profits will be increased by the canal, after paying the irrigation rates." This last proviso must operate as an absolute safeguard against oppression, unless it can be called oppression to make a cultivator do something for the common good, which will at the same time increase his own wealth. Unless it can be shown that he will be a richer man by using the water than by leaving it alone, he will not be forced to pay the water-rate. In this way the peasantry will also be protected against having canals forced upon them by enthusiastic officials. No member of the Indian Government will be allowed to make a hobby of irrigation, so long as his colleagues know that the rate which is to pay for it cannot be raised unless it has been proved that the cultivator will be better off after he has used the water and paid for it than he was before either using it or paying for it.

As regards the objection that a water-rate will set the peasantry against irrigation, two things are to be said. In the first place, this dislike of irrigation is not likely to survive the discovery that they are benefited by it, and they will not be long in making this discovery when they have to pay for the water whether they use it or not. Under a system of voluntary payments, a generation might pass away without the fact finding its way into their minds; under a system of compulsory payments, they may be trusted not to persist in refusing water which it will cost them no more to take than to pass by. In the second place, supposing that a compulsory water-rate even under these conditions would tend to set the peasantry against irrigation, it would not have this effect in nearly the same degree as the additional taxes which will have to be levied if the expense is thrown on the Indian Exchequer instead of being borne by those for whose advantage it is incurred. Observation of results will in time make it clear to the ratepayer that he is a gainer by irrigation. He will see his fields green year after year whether the season be dry or rainy, and he will grow by degrees to understand that his immunity from famine is due to the forethought of the Government. But between an addition to the general taxation of the country and the benefits derived from irrigation there is no obvious connexion, and the peasant who hears that this new burden has been laid upon him for the benefit of a district hundreds of miles away will be a long time in finding out how he is the better for it.

MECHANICAL HUMOUR.

ALL good things are of course speedily imitated; and as competition becomes more intense there is an increasing tendency to rival genuine articles by the cheaper products of machinery. Mr. Ruskin has been driven to a state of permanent irritability by this process as applied to material manufactures. Watt and Arkwright are regarded by him as the tempters who have spoilt our

paradise by their unhallowed arts. Everywhere for the good old homespun work we have flimsy substitutes, artistically contemptible and economically inferior. A similar tendency is manifest even in the fine arts; and we have been told that the remoter colonies are supplied with Titians and Correggios manufactured by wholesale in Birmingham. However this may be, we certainly see symptoms of a similar process applied where at first sight it would seem even less applicable. Literature can be manufactured as well as painting; and, when the art has been developed a little further, we may expect that a publisher will be able to give an order for a volume of sham Dickens or Tennyson as easily as the upholsterer can now order paper of any favourite pattern. To some extent the art has always been practised. Every original writer naturally has a band of imitators. Each new poet has a tune of his own, which can be echoed by tenth-rate writers with surprising facility. The mechanical versification of Pope was peculiarly adapted for such servile imitation; but since his metre palled upon the public ear, we have had half-a-dozen new styles, each of which has been caught up with amazing fidelity. A few years ago all young poets echoed Mr. Tennyson; and if at the present moment we were to offer a prize for poetry, we should confidently expect that half the competitors would talk about roses and raptures as fluently, though not quite so melodiously, as Mr. Swinburne. This is inevitable, and to a certain extent is right and proper. No poet has really succeeded until he has established a school; and even the greatest poets have generally begun by treading more or less distinctly in the footsteps of their latest predecessor. It is still an open question whether a second-rate poet has any right to exist at all; but, if the race is not to be extirpated, they must of necessity echo the few original minds which stamp the character of the age.

There is, however, another department of literature in which we are really more annoyed by the process. Of all things, one would say that humour ought to be spontaneous. Nothing jars upon one's nerves so much as a forced laugh; it is not merely tiresome, but positively painful, to see a face contorted into a grin by way of imitating a genuine smile. One reason is that we realize so easily the difference between the sham and the reality. Nobody ever yet succeeded, it is probable, in laughing at a story of which he did not understand the point so skilfully as to deceive the narrator, though that is a harmless little bit of hypocrisy which we all attempt pretty frequently, and which it would be a breach of good manners to expose. No kind of literature, on the same principle, is so unspeakably tiresome as that in which a man without a sense of humour tries to be funny by imitating some favourite form of facetiousness. And yet the attempt is made so frequently and systematically that the performance must evidently be regarded as easy. And, in fact, a joke appears at first sight to be one of those things for which a definite formula can be provided. There is an old book which professes to be a collection of "rules by which a proper judgment of jests may be formed," and to give a criterion for distinguishing genuine from spurious wit. The favourite dispute as to the proper definitions of wit and humour seems to assume that some quasi-mathematical formula of the kind might really be discovered. The simplest of all forms of wit is punning, and one might suppose that the art of punning could be taught like a rule in arithmetic. We do not affect to despise puns, for it would be brutal to find fault with what has been an undoubted amusement to a large part of the human race. So many generations of Englishmen have been delighted by recognizing the fact that the two words "die" and "dye" have the same sound and a different signification that it would be cruel to proscribe so simple an amusement. There are not too many sources of innocent pleasure in the world, and we cannot afford to cut off any one. All that we need say is that the pleasure is of a rather infantile kind; and that, like other infantile games, it loses its charm when deliberately practised by persons of mature intellect. Another and higher form of wit, which seems to be resolvable into a logical formula, is the bull; though to make a good bull requires very great ingenuity. But when we come to the more refined artifices, where mere logic or language is less concerned, the inferiority of the manufactured to the genuine product becomes more disagreeably manifest. Every true humourist is almost of necessity a mannerist. The peculiar turn of mind to which he owes his power generates a corresponding peculiarity of style; and when the external form is consciously imitated, instead of being spontaneously generated by the mind of the writer, we have the defect which is generally called mannerism. Sterne, for example, or Lamb or Dickens, each invented new and perfectly legitimate forms of humour, which were mechanically repeated by their followers, and, at times, by themselves. Lamb has had fewer imitators than the others, because his humour was the most refined; and any one who tries to follow his method without being guided by his exquisite delicacy of perception becomes instantly and palpably absurd. Such humour cannot be in the least forced without destroying its charm. Humour, on the other hand, like that of Dickens, which is partly the expression of strong animal spirits, and is compatible with the utmost extravagance of language, can be tolerably reproduced by much coarser workmanship; for it implies, when it is genuine, not a delicate balancing of varying intellectual moods, but simply a hearty outburst of unrestrainable fun. Anybody can imitate more or less that kind of humour which in its extreme forms provokes a horse-laugh; but it is not so easy to imitate the fine semi-ironical smile of a cultivated and acute intelligence. The imitators of Dickens, beginning with Dickens himself, have ac-

ordingly been innumerable, and at one time were a real plague of literature. Their methods are too familiar to need description. The short, jerky sentence, the use of preposterous proper names the incessant dwelling upon some little catchword, the use of an elaborate paraphrase to describe some familiar object, are forms of would-be wit which have long ceased to be tolerable. Who has not shuddered on opening some new book and seeing a tail described as a caudal appendage? Such a phrase is the mark of the beast, and would justify us in sending the book to the common hangman if that person continued to exercise his old function.

Of late years another fashion has prevailed which is already a nuisance in need of suppression. American humour was once a very genuine and characteristic product. The humour, for example, of the *Biglow Papers* was singularly fresh, and has preserved the book in spite of the fact that many of its topics and allusions have already become unintelligible to the English reader. It was a full expression of the characteristic qualities of the genuine Yankee before he was swamped by the immigration of millions of Irishmen or had set up to talk philosophy. It was the keen mother-wit of a race distinguished for strong common sense, and marked by a curious reserve produced by a Puritan education or by the natural temperament of the race. Nothing could be better or more racy in its way, though to many tastes it appeared to be rather too dry and to verge at times upon the cynical. This last quality, indeed, is much more conspicuous in some of Hosea's successors, who have chosen to flavour their natural wit with a considerable dose of irreverence. But, not to dwell upon the peculiar qualities of the genuine article, we may admit that even the later or Artemus Ward variety of humourist had some real merits which more or less justified the popularity of their books in England. Unluckily the success has led to a host of imitators, and, as in other cases, the difference between the Brummagem article and that upon which it is moulded is that, whereas the true Yankee humour is the expression of a particular type of intellect, the sham humour represents only the incessant application of a simple trick. Here, again, we might construct a formula which would enable any man of ordinary capacity to manufacture just as much facetiousness of this variety as he pleased. One secret, if it can be called a secret, is simply to speak of things in totally disproportionate language; as, for example, you may either describe a great national solemnity as if it were a meeting of drunken costermongers or adopt the inverse method. But this trick is common to other varieties of humorous writing. To give the special Yankee twang to the mixture, it is desirable to introduce a flavour of blasphemy or cynicism. There are dangers in adopting the first expedient, but the last presents no difficulty whatever. Thus, for example, it has come to be recognized as a very funny mode of speech to describe a hideous crime or a startling accident in entirely inappropriate language. If a dozen passengers have been killed on a railway by the gross neglect of the officials, you have only to say that the clerks playfully sent a wrong message, with the object of gratifying their scientific curiosity as to the collision of heavy bodies; and that, owing to a trifling excess of zeal, a few passengers who had not explicitly consented to the experiment were more or less spoilt in carrying it out. Or, if a brutal labourer kicks his wife to death, it is just as easy as not to say that he took a rather stringent view of the matrimonial relation, and chose to emphasize a delicate remonstrance by administering a few rhetorical flourishes with the toe of an iron-shod boot. This artifice is for a time impressive by its novelty, and does indifferently well for what is called scathing sarcasm. We are struck by the ingenuity of the irony, and think that the writer must be a very clever fellow always to say white when he means us to understand black. But when the dodge has been repeated a few dozen times, it becomes, to our taste at least, inexpressibly wearisome. If you want to call a man a knave, it is simpler in the long run to call him knave than to describe him as a gentleman with eccentric views of moral obligations. It is just as easy to use one phrase as the other; and when the plan of inverting language has once become familiar, it is probably best to use the directest mode of expression.

Why should not such methods of mechanical joking be put down? The only objection is probably one which recalls Mr. Mill's early cause of melancholy. He was afraid that all the tunes in the world would be used up; and in the same way, funny writers are probably afraid that every known variety of joke will be worn out. They therefore continue to use over and over again the same good old device of grim humour which Swift originated in the proposal for eating Irish babies. Without giving our reasons for thinking the fear chimerical, we may simply observe that the cure is worse than the evil. If all tunes were being exhausted, we should still decline to be grateful to persons who should insist upon always regaling our ears with a single effete melody. And on the same principle, we would rather have no facetious writing at all than a facetiousness which is becoming more tiresome than the most deadly solemnity.

SWITZERLAND IN ITALY.

THE mysteries of tourist geography are endless. We trust that our readers have not forgotten the difficulty which Messrs. Cook and Co. felt, after crossing St. Gotthard, in "believing that they were still in the land which produced a Tell." On the other hand, Messrs. Bradshaw and Co., an equally high authority, define a certain, or uncertain, part of the earth's

surface as "Switzerland or the Alpine country." We may suppose therefore that they would not share Messrs. Cook's difficulty in believing that a Tell had been produced anywhere where there are Alps. We remember, years and years ago, seeing a playbill which announced the performance of "Hofer, or the Tell of the Tyrol." Would Messrs. Cook feel the same difficulty anywhere about Innsbruck which they felt somewhere about Bellinzona? Or would Messrs. Bradshaw rule that, as Tyrol is an Alpine country, it is therefore Switzerland, and a land in which we have a right to look for the production of Tells. To be sure Tell, in the legend, shot somebody else, while Hofer, in the history, got shot himself; but this is a slight matter so long as both had something to do with mountains and something to do with shooting. Tell has been long ago ruled to be the Sun-god, and we have no doubt that, with a little exercise of ingenuity, a place in mythology might be found for Hofer also. Still, though we must be allowed our laugh at the way in which our guides put forth their thoughts, there is a meaning in the somewhat grotesque utterances of both of them. Whether we look at the map or at the land itself, there is a certain seeming strangeness in Ticino being a Swiss Canton, and this we conceive to be Messrs. Cook's meaning, when the flourish about producing a Tell has been "biled and peeled." On the other hand, if, with Messrs. Bradshaw, we take the less sentimental line of physical geography, if we assume that "the Alpine country" must have a distinct being of its own, we should certainly not fix its boundaries at the present boundaries of the Swiss Confederation. There are purposes—and we have no doubt that climbing purposes are among them—for which it would not be convenient to attend very carefully to the frontier on the map. It does seem odd that a man at Mendrisio should not be a countryman of his neighbour at Como, of his own speech and manners, and that he should be the countryman of the man of distant Basel with whom he seems to have nothing in common. And, on the other hand, when we have got the notion—from a physical point of view, by no means an unnatural notion—of an "Alpine country" as something which has a distinct existence, there is something strange in finding that "the monarch of mountains" has no part or lot in the land which is held to be peopled with his subjects. After all, the state of mind which is puzzled at finding that certain parts of Switzerland are Switzerland, and that certain parts of other countries are not Switzerland, has its parallels in our own islands. It is a received article of the tourist's faith that a certain part of Lancashire is, for tourist purposes, to be looked on as Cumberland, and that a large part of Somerset is, with still less of excuse, to be looked on as Devonshire.

But, leaving tourists aside, the existence of an Italian, as well as of a German and a Burgundian, Switzerland will supply the thoughtful traveller with several subjects for musing, geographical, historical, and political. Why is it that it seems strange to find Switzerland south of the Alps any more than north? If the "Alpine country," the land of mountains and valleys and lakes, is held to have a separate being of its own, the "Alpine country" may just as reasonably take in the southern as the northern slopes and spurs of the great mountain range. If we look on the mountains themselves as a natural boundary, if we rule all to the south to be naturally Italy, we may rule all to the north to be naturally Germany. If the Rhine is supposed to be a natural boundary in the one case, the Po will do just as well in the other. The truth is that, as far as natural and historical boundaries go, there is just as much reason for carrying Germany up the northern slope of St. Gotthard as there is for carrying Italy up the southern slope. If Lugano and Bellinzona are naturally Italian, Zürich and Luzern are just as much naturally German. Yet not only people who fancy that Switzerland has been a separate country from all eternity, but those who know how the Old League of High Germany really began and spread, cannot withstand some degree of Mr. Cook's feeling of incongruity on finding that, in the valley of the Ticino, and even at the southern end of the Lake of Lugano, we are still on Confederate ground. The real cause of the feeling of incongruity lies in the peculiar history of the single Italian canton, as compared with that of the German and the Burgundian cantons. Of the original cantons we need not say that none was Italian; if we were to say that none was Burgundian, we should be sinning against strict geographical accuracy, for as late as the fifteenth century Bern was sung of

Als Krone im Burgundenreich;

but all at least were thoroughly German in speech and history. But of the two classes of Romance-speaking lands which now form part of the Confederation, the League has spread itself in quite different ways into the land of *Oc* and into the land of *St.* In the Burgundian lands the Confederates were not mere conquerors; Vaud undoubtedly was strictly a conquered land, but Geneva, Neuchâtel, and the former bishopric of Basel, were all allies before they became Confederates. But south of the Alps the Confederates appeared as mere conquerors, as alien and aggressive rulers. In the land which forms the present Canton of Ticino there was in the old state of things not only no canton, but no ally. All was mere subject land conquered or ceded, districts subject to this or that canton or groups of cantons. As long as we climb the St. Gotthard pass on its northern side, the name of Uri keeps its natural meaning of eternal freedom; cross over into the Levantine valley, and the name of Uri means only the hardest bondage. The men who so stoutly refused to acknowledge any master over themselves were quite ready to become the despotic masters of others. Pass

a little lower, Bellinzona stands encompassed by her three castles, in which the *Foys* of Uri, Schwyz, and Unterwalden lived to hold down the conquered Italians quite as straitly as ever the mythical Gessler could have held their own forefathers. In the later acquisitions to the south, the common property of the Confederates, the rule was the same; all was bondage, only it is said that the yoke of oligarchy pressed lighter on the subject than the yoke of democracy, and that the Italian bailiwicks felt it as a comparative respite when the turn to rule over them passed from Uri or Unterwalden to Bern or Zürich.

It is plain that the connexion of a land under these circumstances with the Confederation was of another kind from that of the Romance-speaking allies, or even the Romance-speaking subjects, north of the Alps. Vaud had its wrongs; but they were hardly so heavy as the wrongs of Bellinzona and the Levantine Valley. No change could have been greater than that which turned these lands, with their various and shifting lords, into the independent Canton of Ticino. The neighbouring land, which stood in the same relation to the Three Leagues of Rhetia as they did to the Confederacy, was doomed to another fate. In the case of the Valtellina, the connexion between master and subject was wholly broken. When Graubünden became a Swiss Canton, Chiavenna and Bormio were wholly cut asunder from it, and they have since followed the shifting destinies of Northern Italy. This, we may add, makes the position of Ticino, and its look on the map, yet more incongruous. If the Valtellina had become another Italian Canton, the isolation of Ticino would have been greatly lessened. It would no longer have so thoroughly the look of a piece of one land running irregularly into another. As it is, the boundary which divides Switzerland from Italy seems to be one of the most artificial and capricious in the whole map of Europe. There is no visible reason why this scrap of the side of a lake should be Swiss and that other scrap Italian. Only we must remember that there is just as little visible reason why Schaffhausen should be Swiss and Constanx German. The purely geographical difficulty is the same on both sides.

The fusion of Ticino with the rest of Switzerland would seem, at least on the Ticinese side, to have been complete. The difficulties of Messrs. Cook must have risen to their height as they stood by the shores of the Lake of Lugano, under an Italian sky and surrounded by purely Italian buildings, and saw that the spot on which they stood was called "Piazza Guglielmo Tell." Old differences must have been pretty well forgotten when a patriotic citizen of Lugano could, as a sign of his patriotism, set up a statue of the hero of his former oppressors. We do not remember that Vaud reverences the particular heroes of Bern; but then Vaud has some kind of claim to heroes of its own, while we are not aware that Ticino, as a land apart from both Italy and Switzerland, ever had any.

The history of these subjects seems at first sight to contradict certain lessons which we learn from the analogous pages in the history of old Greece. In Greece democracy seems better able to undertake the government of dependencies than oligarchy. In Switzerland, and we may say in Italy, it was the reverse. Athens was a less harsh mistress than Sparta, but Uri was clearly a harsher mistress than Bern. Is the cause of the difference that in Greece the highest civilization was to be found in a democratic city, while in Switzerland the rural democracies naturally lagged in all outward respects behind the civic oligarchies? Yet democratic Florence was at least as highly advanced in these matters as oligarchic Venice, and certainly none of the Italian dependencies of Venice were so bitter against their mistress as Pisa was against Florence. Is it that the utter failure of Sparta in the government of dependencies arose, not so much from the mere fact of the government being oligarchic, as from the special nature of that government and of the national character? From the little that we know of Corinth, her aristocracy seems, notwithstanding the malicious hatred of Korkyra, to have more successfully grappled with this problem. Setting forms of government apart, a man of Uri sent to govern a subject district must have been very like a Spartan harmost; the Athenian and the Bernese had each of them much better experience at home. And as for Florence, we must remember the intense spirit of local and civic rivalry among the Italian commonwealths—a spirit in which Venice, a fragment of the East resting at anchor alongside of Italy, had no share. In her Lombard neighbours she might have enemies, she might have subjects, but she had no rivals. Verona and Brescia were not to her as Pisa was to Florence. Add also that Athens, a commonwealth formed, not only of the city of Athens but of the whole land of Attica, was less distinctly local and civic than Florence, the very embodiment of those feelings. On the whole, we may say that, while the rule of one city or district over another is in itself unjust, the yoke may be much lighter or heavier in different cases, and that the lightness or heaviness of the yoke does not depend wholly on the form of government of the ruling State, but on several causes, of which that is only one.

One lesson more may be drawn from this seemingly incongruous land of Swiss Italy or Italian Switzerland. In the long run of history a momentary loss may be a final gain, and a momentary gain may be a final loss. The districts in the Netherlands which were added to France by Louis the Fourteenth doubtless gained at the time; for, bad as the rule of France was, that of Spain was incomparably worse. But, besides that France in annexing Artois annexed Robespierre, just as in annexing Corsica she annexed Buonaparte, those provinces remained to Spain then, they would now serve a European purpose in strengthening inde-

pendent Belgium. So, on the other hand, the Italian lands which were subject to the Confederation were perhaps worse off even than lands under a Duke of Milan or a King of Spain; certainly they were far worse off than lands under an Austrian Emperor or a French King of Italy. But because these lands lived on in their bondage, a worse bondage than that of any of their neighbours, they have been in the end rewarded with the highest freedom.

So we muse beside the statue of Tell at Lugano, beneath the campanile of Santa Maria degli Angioli, beside the vast hotel into which his monastery has been so strangely changed. The hero never existed; if he did exist, Lugano had no share in him; yet it is a sign that no small change has been wrought, when his image is deemed to be as much at home by the shores of the Italian lake as it is on the shores of the German lake around which his legend first came into being.

ENGLISH CLERGYMEN IN FOREIGN WATERING-PLACES.

THOSE persons who object to the influence of the clergy in their parishes at home, and who dislike the idea of being laid hold of by the ecclesiastical crook and dragged up steep ways and narrow paths, ought to visit some of our little outlying settlements in foreign parts. They might take a revengeful pleasure in seeing how the tables there are turned against the tyrants here, and how weak in the presence of his transmarine flock is the expatriated shepherd whose rod at home is oftentimes a rod of iron, and his crook more compelling than persuasive. Of all men the most to be pitied is surely the clergyman of one of those small English settlements which are scattered about France and Italy, Germany and Switzerland; and of all men of education, and what is meant by the position of a gentleman, he is the most in thralldom. His very means of living depending on his congregation, he must first of all please that congregation and keep it in good humour. So, it may be said, must a clergyman in London whose income is from pew-rents, and whose congregation are not his parishioners. But London is large; the tempers and thoughts of men are as numerous as the houses; there is room for all, and lines of affinity for all. The Broad Churchman will attract his hearers, and the Ritualist his, from out of the mass, as magnets attract steel filings, and each church will be filled with hearers who come there by preference. But in a small and stationary society, in a congregation already made and not specially attracted, yet by which he has to live, the clergyman finds himself more the servant than the leader, less the pastor than the thrall. He must "suit," else he is nowhere, and his bread and butter are vanishing points in his horizon; that is, he must preach and think, not according to the truth that is in him, but according to the views of the most influential of his hearers, and in attacking their souls he must touch tenderly on their tempers.

These tempers are for the most part lions in the way difficult to propitiate. The elementary doctrines of Christianity must be preached of course, and sin must be held up as the thing to avoid, while virtue must be complimented as the thing to be followed, and a spiritual state of mind must be discreetly advocated. These are safe generalities, but the dangers of application are many. How to preach of duties to a body of men and women who have for the time thrown off every national and local obligation, who have left their estates to be managed by agents, their houses to be filled by strangers; who have given up their share of interest in the school and the village reading-room, the poor and the parish generally; men and women who have handed themselves over to indolence and pleasure-seeking, the luxurious enjoyment of a fine climate, the pleasant increase of income to be got by comparative cheapness of breadstuffs, and the abandonment of all those outgoings roughly comprised under the head of local duties and local obligations? They have no duties to be reminded of in those moral generalizations which touch all and offend none; and the clergyman who should go into details affecting his congregation personally, who should preach against sloth and slander, pleasure-seeking and selfishness, would soon preach to empty pews and be cut by all his friends as an impertinent going beyond his office.

His congregation too, composed of educated ladies and gentlemen, is sure to be critical, and therefore all but impossible to teach. If he inclines a hair's breadth to the right or the left beyond the point at which they themselves stand, he is held to be unsound. His sermons are gravely canvassed in the afternoon conclaves which meet at each other's houses to discuss the excitement of the Sunday morning in the new arrivals or the new toilets. Has he dwelt on the humanity underlying the Christian faith? He is drifting into Socinianism, and those whose inclinations go for abstract dogmas well backed by brimstone say that he does not preach the Gospel. Has he exalted the functions of the minister, and tried to invest his office with a spiritual dignity and power that would furnish a good leverage over his flock? He is accused of sacerdotalism, and the free-citizen blood of his listening Erastians is up and flaming. Does he, to avoid these stumbling-blocks, wander into the deeper mysteries and discourse on things which no man can either explain or understand? He is accused of presumption and profanity, and advised to stick to the Lord's Prayer and the Sermon on the Mount. If he is earnest he is impertinent; if he is level he is cold. Each member of his congregation, subscribing a couple of guineas towards his support, feels as if he or she had claims to that amount over the body and soul and mind and powers of the poor parson in his

or her pay; and the claim is generally worked out in snippets not individually dangerous to life or fortune, but inexpressibly aggravating, and as depressing as annoying. For the most part, the unhappy man is safest when he sticks to broad dogma, and leaves personal morality alone. And he is almost sure to be warmly applauded when he has a shy at science, and asserts that physicists are fools who assert more than they can prove, because they cannot show why an acorn should produce an oak, or how the phenomena of thought are elaborated. This throwing of date-stones is sure to strike no listening djinn. The mass of the congregations sitting in the English Protestant churches built on foreign soil know little and care less about the physical sciences, but it gives them a certain comfortable glow to think that they are so much better than those sinful and presumptuous men who work at gases and the spectroscope, and they hug themselves as they say, each man to his own soul, how much nicer it is to be dogmatically safe than intellectually learned.

Preaching personal morality indeed, with possible private application, would be rather difficult in dealing with a congregation not unfrequently made up of doubtful elements. Take that pretty young woman and her handsome *roué*-looking husband who have come no one knows whence, and are no one knows who, but who attend the services with praiseworthy punctuality, have any amount of money, and are being gradually incorporated into the society of the place. The parson may have had private hints conveyed to him from his friends at home that, of the matrimonial conditions between the two, everything is real save the assumed "lines." But how is he to say so? They have made themselves valuable members of his congregation, and give larger donations than any one else; they have got the good will of the leading persons in the sacred community, and, having something to hide, are naturally careful to please, and consequently popular; he can scarcely give form and substance to the hints he has had conveyed to him; yet his conscience cries out on the one side, if his weakness binds him to silence on the other. In any case, how can he make himself the Nathan to this questionable David, and, holding forth on the need of virtuous living, thunder out, "Thou art the man!" Let him try the experiment, and he will find a hornets' nest nothing to it. How, too, can he preach on honesty to men, perhaps his own churchwardens, who have outrun the constable and outwitted their creditors at one and the same time? how lecture women who flirt over the borders on the week days, but pay handsomely for their sittings on Sundays, on the crown with which Solomon endowed the lucky husband of the virtuous woman? He may wish to do all this; but his wife and children, and the supreme need of food and firing, step in between him and the higher functions of his calling; and he owns himself forced to accept the world as he finds it, sins and shortcomings with the rest, and to take heed lest he be eaten up by over-zeal or carried into personal darkness by his desire for his people's light.

Sometimes the poor man is in thrall to some one in particular rather than to his flock as a body; and sometimes the dominant power is a woman; in which case the many contrarieties besetting his position may be multiplied *ad infinitum*. Nothing can exceed the miserable subjection of the clergyman to a feminine despot. She knows everything, and she governs as much as she knows. She makes herself the arbiter of his whole life, from his conscience to his children's boots, and he can call neither his soul nor his home his own. She prescribes his doctrine, and takes care to let him know when he has transgressed the rules she has laid down for his guidance. She treats the hymns as part of her personal prerogative, and is violently offended if those having a Ritualistic tendency are sung, or if those are taken whereof the tunes are too jaunty or the measure too slow. The unfortunate man feels under her eye during the whole of the service like a schoolboy under the eye of his preceptor; and he dare not even begin the opening sentences until she has rustled up the aisle and has said her private prayer quite comfortably. She holds over his head the terror of vague threats and shadowy misfortunes should he cross her will; but at the same time he does not find that running easy in her harness brings extra grist to his mill, or that his way is the smoother because he treads in the footsteps she has marked out for him. Sometimes she takes a craze against a voluntary, sometimes she objects to any approach to chanting, and if certain recalcitrants of the congregation, in possession of the harmonium, insist on their own methods against hers, she writes home to the Society and complains of the thin edge of the wedge and the Romanizing tendencies of her spiritual adviser. In any case she is a fearful infliction; and a church ruled by a female despot is about the most pitiable instance we know of insolent tyranny and broken-backed dependence.

But the clergymen serving these transmarine stations are themselves not often men of mark nor equal to their contemporaries at home. They are often sickly, which means a low amount of vital energy; oftener impecunious, which precludes real independence. They are men whose career has been somehow arrested, and their natures have suffered in the blight that has befallen their hopes. Their whole life is more or less a compromise, now with conscience, now with character, and they have to wink at evils which they ought to denounce, and bear with annoyances which they ought to resent. In most cases they are obliged to eke out their scanty incomes by taking pupils; and here again the millstone round their necks is heavy, and they pay a large moral percentage on their pecuniary gains. If their

pupils are of the age when boys begin to call themselves men, they have to keep a sharp look-out on them; and they suffer many things on the score of responsibility when that look-out is evaded, as it necessarily must be at times. As the characteristic quality of small societies is gossip, and as gossip always includes exaggeration, the peccadilloes of the young fellows are magnified into serious sins, and then bound as a burden on the back of the poor cleric in thrall to the idle imaginings of men and the foolish fears of women. One black sheep in the pupillary flock will do more damage to the reputation of the unhappy pastor who has them in hand than a dozen shining lights will do him good. Morality is assumed to be the free gift of the tutor to the pupil, and if the boy is bad the man is to blame for not having made that free gift betimes.

Look at it how we will, the clergyman in charge of these foreign congregations has no very pleasant time of it. In a sense expatriated, his home ties growing daily weaker, his hope of home preferment reduced to *nil*, his liberty of conscience a dream of the past, and all the mystical power of his office going down in the conflict caused by the need of pew-rents, submission to tyrants, and dependence on the Home Society, he lives from year to year bemoaning the evil chances which have flung him on this barren, shifting, and desolate strand, and becoming less and less fitted for England and English parochial work—that castle in the air, quiet and secure, which he is destined never to inhabit. He is touched too in part by the atmosphere of his surroundings; and to a congregation without duties a clergyman with views more accommodating than severe comes only too naturally as the appropriate pastor. The whole thing proves that thralldom to the means of living, or rather to the persons representing those means, damages all men alike—those in cassock and gown as well as those in slop and blouse—and that lay influence can, in certain circumstances, be just as tyrannical over the clerical conscience as clerical influence is apt to be tyrannical over lay living.

THE "SYNOPTICAL TABLES" OF THE UNIVERSITIES COMMISSION.

THE Universities Commissioners, at great inconvenience to themselves as well as to everybody else concerned, have accumulated a mass of information which they have hitherto been unable properly to digest. They handsomely acknowledge that they have given much trouble to Bursars and other officers by seeking information "in order to elucidate the inquiries according to the method which has been pursued." There used to be a story of a mathematician who dreamed that he was under the sign of the square root and could not extract himself. Henceforth the usual form of academical nightmare will probably be to fancy oneself Bursar of one's college engaged in "the compilation of elaborate returns and information in very minute detail" required by the University Commission "in order adequately to discharge the duty entrusted to it." It must be owned that the Commissioners have spared neither themselves nor others. They have painfully collected details, and they have rashly attempted generalization. They obtained Returns and framed Abstracts of them, and if they had stopped here nothing could be urged against them except that they had perhaps given unnecessary trouble. But unfortunately they proceeded to frame "Synoptical Tables" from the Abstracts, and these Tables have been impugned by letters in the *Times*, whereupon the Secretary to the Commission avows that they are not and cannot be what they profess to be. "The Synoptical Tables were never intended," writes Mr. Roundell, "to be read without the explanations and qualifications contained in the Abstracts of Returns." It is a pity that the Report did not declare the intention of its authors. We should have supposed that a synopsis was meant to be accepted as correct so far as it went, but if we must end by reading the Abstracts, we might as well have begun with them.

We observe that the accounts of St. John's College, Cambridge, are made up on a different principle from that of all the other Colleges, and as the Master of St. John's was a member of the Commission, and probably understood the subject in hand as well as any member of it, this divergence on a cardinal point is remarkable. It arises in regard to Trust Estates, to which the Commissioners tell us that their attention has been especially called, as indeed it could not fail to be. A moderate acquaintance with the finance of any College would suffice to show that these Trust Estates were likely to be a *crux* to the compiler of Synoptical Tables. The Commissioners have sufficiently indicated in the Report the difficulty that might be expected to arise. "There are only a very few cases in which the beneficial interest of the trust property is wholly external to the University or College which holds the trust. In almost all cases the trustee-corporation has a beneficial interest, either contingent or partial, in the trust estate." We need quote no further to show that a correct view of the property held by the Colleges for purposes of education and learning could not be obtained without reference to these Trust Estates. It is well observed in the Report that "trust funds, although not divisible among the Head and Fellows of a College, yet in many cases indirectly increase the divisible revenue, inasmuch as they bear charges for chapel, library, repairs and the like which would otherwise fall on the general funds of the College." Among the objects of these trusts are the maintenance of or aid towards a professorship, teachership, or lectureship; scholarships or exhibitions, with preference for candidates from some particular school or district,

and power to the College to elect by open competition in default of properly-qualified candidates; prizes; the purchase of benefices, and the improvement of benefices in the gift of the College. As an example of a trust fund of which the beneficial interest is wholly external to the College that holds it we may take that of Pate's Charity, held by Corpus Christi College, Oxford, of which the income is about 1,600*l.* a year. The College receives one-fourth of the income of this fund for its corporate use, and pays three-fourths to certain charitable uses at Cheltenham of which the maintenance of the Grammar School of that town is the chief. In this case therefore it is clear that one-fourth, or about 400*l.* a year, ought to be added to the "corporate income" of the College, while, as regards the other three-fourths, the College has not even a contingent or partial interest. As an example of the opposite kind to this, we will take the Trust Funds of St. John's College, Oxford, of which the income is about 1,350*l.* a year, out of which about 1,000*l.* a year is paid to the Fereday Fellows and Casberd Scholars, who become on election, if they were not before, members of the College. It would seem therefore that the College has what may fairly be called a beneficial interest in the larger part of these Trust Funds, and that, in order to get at the income of St. John's College, according to popular understanding of the term, we ought to add about 1,000*l.* a year to the income given in the Report. The plan of the Commissioners is, however, to keep the income of these Trust Estates separate from what they call Corporate Income at the outset of their Report, although they lump the whole in one grand total at the end. But it is plain that in no reasonable sense of words can the three-fourths of Pate's Charity which is spent in Cheltenham be regarded as University or College property, whereas the Trust Fund by which the Fereday Fellows of St. John's College are paid might fairly be so regarded. We dwell on these details in order to show the danger of generalizing on this subject, or, in other words, of attempting to frame Synoptical Tables which shall convey at a glance a correct idea of the result of a complicated and difficult inquiry.

This principle of separating the Trust Funds from the Corporate Income was, however, adopted by the Commissioners in all cases except that of St. John's College, Cambridge, of which the Master was a member of the Commission. The total income of that College was returned to the Commission at nearly 50,000*l.* a year, of which upwards of 4,000*l.* a year arises from Trust Funds. The Abstract of the Return for that College has appended to it a letter from the Master to the Secretary of the Commission, giving the total income from corporate and trust property, deducting the total expenditure, and showing the balance. This is as much as to say that the Commissioners may arrange the figures of other Colleges as fancy dictates, but the Master of St. John's College will take care that its accounts shall be rendered in what he conceives to be a business-like manner. We have no information as to the precise purposes to which the Trust Funds of this College are applicable. But probably the assumption that they are for the benefit of the College would be nearer the truth than the opposite assumption that they are for external purposes. The same assumption, however, might be made as to a large part of the Trust Funds of other Colleges which are not added to the Corporate Income as has been done at St. John's College. It follows that when the Synoptical Table shows the Corporate Income of St. John's College on the same principle as has been adopted for other Colleges at 46,000*l.* a year, it makes that income in the judgment of the Master too little by 4,000*l.* a year. This, however, is a trivial matter compared with that which is made the subject of complaint by the Treasurer of Christ Church, Oxford. The internal income of that College from "room-rents, fees, profits of establishment, and other like sources," appears in the Abstract of Returns at upwards of 10,000*l.* a year, but the same Abstract shows that upwards of 6,000*l.* a year is disbursed for "college servants" and "maintenance of establishment." The Treasurer complains that this sum of 10,000*l.* a year is made to appear in the Synoptical Table as clear income, whereas at least 6,000*l.* ought to be deducted from it. When this complaint is brought by the *Times* to the notice of the Secretary, he answers with perfect gravity that "uniformity of principle in framing the Tables was precluded by the necessities of the case." We should have thought, if that were so, that the framing of Tables was precluded also, and that the world might have gone on without them. The Treasurer illustrates the treatment which Christ Church has undergone by reference to the case of an hotel whose gross receipts are considered as net profits. It happens, too, that for other Colleges net profits have been taken as income, and thus Christ Church appears richer in comparison with those Colleges than it really is.

It is, we think, matter for regret that the Commissioners gave themselves the trouble to compile these Tables. Mr. Carlyle speaks somewhere of persons who have never seen the book of nature, but only some school synopsis thereof, "from which, if taken for the real book, more error than insight is to be derived." The Secretary to this Commission, however, seems to have contemplated that everybody would read all that the Commission published, and we are bound to say that those who desire to understand the subject had better do so. The Commissioners have caused trouble to the Bursars, and incurred risk of error, by requiring, whether rightly or wrongly we do not say, accounts to be furnished in forms different from those customary in the Colleges. Thus it appears from the Abstract of Returns for Trinity College, Cambridge, that in the year 1871 "Fellows (524)" divided among them 18,371*l.* It might be inferred from a mere perusal of the abstract that there are only 52 or 53 Fellows of Trinity, whereas there are really 60 Fellows;

and it is probable that if the accounts of that College had been produced as the Bursar keeps them this fact would clearly appear. The internal income of Trinity College appears by the abstract to be nearly 10,000*l.* a year, but we observe that the two items of disbursement "College Servants" and "Maintenance" amount to nearly 8,000*l.* a year, and it is highly probable that the accounts, properly stated, would show no "internal income" at all, or perhaps a loss. If indeed there were any distinct advantage in framing the accounts as required by the Commissioners, we feel sure that the Bursars would not mind the trouble. But if the only result of much labour and vexation is to enable the Secretary to frame Synoptical Tables which, he assures us, were never meant to be relied upon, we think that perhaps the Bursars may be excused for feeling a little irritation. The Commissioners "regret to say that Sidney Sussex College failed to give the required information," and we observe that Corpus Christi and Queen's Colleges, Cambridge, have answered the inquiries of the Commissioners imperfectly in several respects. Both these Colleges appear to consider the distribution of the tuition fees as a private matter of the tutors, but we think that on further reflection they will hardly maintain that view. It is quite possible indeed that the trouble which the Commissioners have been "obliged to give" may have been more strongly felt because its utility was not clearly perceived. But if the Returns are required in future years, as they probably will be, it would be desirable that some uniform system of making them should be adopted.

A PROTESTANT VIEW OF THE FALK LAWS.

THE letters on the Falk Laws which originally appeared in the *Morning Post*, and have since been copied into other English journals, contain very remarkable testimony from what appears to be an unsuspicious source as to the real nature and effects of the recent ecclesiastical legislation in Germany. The writer, whose name is of course for obvious reasons withheld, is stated by the editor of the *Post* to be "a German Evangelical divine of the highest distinction," and he looks at the new laws primarily, though not exclusively, in their bearing on his own communion. But he is well aware that whatever objections may be raised from the Evangelical side have an *à fortiori* application to the Roman Catholic aspect of the question; and although he pointedly disclaims all sympathy with "the theory of an infallible visible Church," he is anxious that Roman Catholics and Protestants alike should have fair play, and considers the religious interests common to both seriously compromised by the religious policy of the Prince Chancellor. He begins by explaining the difficulty experienced by "an Evangelical Christian" in forming a judgment on these laws, as well from his profound disapproval of the Vatican decrees which formed the pretext for their enactment, as from the strenuous endeavours of "the numerous journals subsidized for the occasion to represent the recent legislation as necessary, useful, and in no way injurious to religious life." He himself holds Papal infallibility to be only a logical conclusion from previous "Roman errors," and disputes the right of the Old Catholics to protest against it, and of the State to regard it as involving any fundamental change in the mutual relations of the civil and ecclesiastical authorities. These, however, are matters of abstract opinion. The real interest of the paper lies in its handling of the facts of the case. The writer roundly asserts that the origin of the new legislation is to be mainly attributed to "the personal decision" of Prince Bismarck. It was when the Ultramontane party in the Reichstag opposed his policy of centralization, and "he appeared to have made certain discoveries, of which there has been no further elucidation," implicating their loyalty and patriotism, that the Vatican decrees were first discovered to be dangerous to the State, the Old Catholics were ostentatiously patronized, and this "cornucopia of exceptional laws and regulations overflowed against the Church"—and, "for the sake of equality," against the Evangelical Church also—"which practically issues in the establishment of the absolute omnipotence of the State in the religious domain." On this it is obvious to remark that, whether or not any more satisfactory account of the origin of the Falk Laws is producible than the *sic volo, sic jubeo* of the Imperial Chancellor, none has in fact been produced. The mysterious revelations which he darkly hinted at in the Reichstag, of Roman Catholic treachery and Jesuit machinations against the Empire, remain locked up, like the plenitude of Papal privileges before the Vatican Council, *in scrinio pectoris sui*. They must be accepted, if at all, on faith, and the public must be content, without knowing the dream, to witness the interpretation thereof in the system of minute persecution which our author next proceeds to exhibit and criticize in detail. The salient points of his indictment we purpose to reproduce for the benefit of our readers.

He begins with the new regulation on abuse of the pulpit, introduced into the Penal Code of the German Empire in 1871, which certainly does appear to constitute a portentous interference with ordinary liberty of speech. For it empowers the civil tribunals to punish with imprisonment, for a term not exceeding two years, any reference to civil affairs made by a clergyman in his official capacity, whether in church or elsewhere, which they may choose to regard as "calculated to disturb the public peace." Our critic observes that there are various local ordinances and by-laws, desecrating the Sabbath, banishing religion from schools, secularizing marriage and the like, which are most obnoxious to his coreligionists, but

against which no Evangelical minister, under this statute, could dare to open his lips. He probably speaks from experience, for it is notorious that several Evangelical pastors have been sent to prison under the provisions of the new code. The next point noticed is the transference, by a law of 1872, of the entire control and inspection of all schools throughout Prussia from the ecclesiastical to the civil authorities, and this in spite of the 24th Article of the Prussian Constitution still unrepealed, which provides that "the religious communities interested shall direct the religious instruction." It appears that the law has been carried out in such a manner as to supersede all clerical influence in schools; and the writer points out that, if its object was to guard against anti-national teaching by Roman Catholic inspectors, it is at once extravagant and inoperative. For the immediate purpose would have been equally attained by removing any particular inspectors open to such a charge; while priests who are so minded can still take advantage of their instructions for Confirmation and in the confessional to instil sentiments of hostility to the State—and are, he might have added, far more likely to do so than they were before. It will now, we are reminded, depend wholly on the caprice of a future Minister whether Christianity shall be altogether banished from the schools, and a Secularist system of education, after the Dutch model, established in its place. The elaborate comment which follows on the expulsion of the Jesuits has an especial value in one sense, because here the writer is something more than an impartial witness. He looks on the Jesuits as the avowed enemies of the Evangelical Church, and speaks in strong terms of their "lax and objectionable morality." Nevertheless he unhesitatingly condemns the law against them on four different counts. It is dangerously vague, from its sweeping inclusion of "kindred orders and congregations" which it does not define; it is inequitable, for the Society is so completely part and parcel of the Roman Church that, where the former has a recognized legal existence, the latter cannot consistently be excluded; it is an arbitrary violation of personal freedom to dictate or interdict the residence in a particular place of persons who have not been convicted of any crime, simply as being members of a certain corporation; and lastly the law is impolitic, for the bodily expulsion of the Jesuits only tends to increase their moral and spiritual influence, as is shown in the case of Bavaria, Saxony, Württemberg and Baden, from whence the Order has long since been banished. "A contest with material weapons against spiritual convictions is always immoral and defeats its own ends"—a remark, by the way, which does not apply to one item only of the Prussian ecclesiastical legislation.

The writer goes on to examine the four laws of May 1873, with special reference to their bearing on the Evangelical Church. And before doing so he cites the 15th and 18th fundamental Articles of the Prussian Constitution, which had to be altered—we have seen already that the 24th was quietly ignored—before these new laws could be enacted. They now run as follows, the words in *italics*, which it will be seen amount virtually to a repeal of the original Article, having been interpolated in 1873:—

Art. 15. The Evangelical and Roman Catholic Churches, as well as every other religious community, order and administer their own affairs independently, but remain subject to the statutes and legal inspection of the State. *In the same measure, every religious community remains in possession and enjoyment of the establishments, foundations, and endowments appertaining to its various objects, religious, educational, and charitable.*

Art. 18. The rights of nomination, proposal, election, and confirmation in the filling up of ecclesiastical offices are abolished, so far as depends upon the State, and so far as the rights of patrons and other legal privileges are not involved. *This provision does not apply to the appointments of clergymen in the army and other legal institutions. Moreover the law regulates the privileges of the State in reference to the training, the appointment, and dismissal of clergymen and ministers of religion, and fixes the limits of ecclesiastical disciplinary power.*

This last addition has certainly all the force of a lady's postscript.

We now come to the May laws, which our author calls "the abrogation of the Habeas Corpus Acts of the Church," since they deprive the Roman and Protestant Churches alike of their independence. First there is the law of May 11, which places all educational institutions for clerical training under the absolute control of the State, forbids the opening of new boys' seminaries or the admission of new pupils into those already existing, requires all intending candidates for holy orders to pass a final examination in a German gymnasium, then to spend three years in a German State University or a Seminary approved by the Minister of Worship, and lastly to pass a public State examination in scientific subjects. It further subjects all appointments to any ecclesiastical office to the approval of the Oberpräsident of the district, whose duty it will be to reject nominees who have not fulfilled the legal conditions, or have been convicted or are accused of any offence punishable with hard labour or loss of civil rights, or of whom he may have reason to suppose that they will act in contravention of any actual or future laws of the State or decrees lawfully promulgated by the Government. Severe penalties of fine and imprisonment are affixed to the breach of any of these regulations, in accordance with which, as we need hardly remark, several Prussian Bishops have already been imprisoned and two are now threatened with deposition. There is a right of appeal to the new Supreme Court for ecclesiastical matters, which is a purely secular one. The writer complains bitterly of the tyrannical interference of this law in several particulars with the liberties and discipline of the Evangelical Church.

It prevents her ministers from studying, as has been very common hitherto, at Swiss, or French, or English Universities; it subjects their whole theological training to "the dominant latitudinarianism in Prussian governing circles," and exacts of them at the end of the course a scientific test not required of doctors or jurists, which would bar the ordination of a candidate whose opinions conflicted with those of the examiner; for it has been openly avowed that the aim of this examination is to replace "denominational definiteness" by "a broad and national education," or in other words to make the clergy rationalistic. Moreover the State reserves to itself by this law the right of excluding from orders or from clerical office any one who has, whether privately or publicly and in whatever fashion, made himself obnoxious to the existing Government; and thereby "the mainspring of the Church's authority, the filling of its offices with suitable persons, is taken away or seriously impeded." This has already been exemplified in the case of the Roman Catholic Bishops, and the Evangelical Church will be no less injuriously affected.

The law of May 12, on Church discipline, precludes all foreign ecclesiastics from exercising jurisdiction in Germany, and makes all but the most unimportant acts of ecclesiastical jurisdiction dependent on the sanction of the civil power; it also constitutes a Supreme Court of Appeal, consisting of eleven lay members, six of whom must be judges, which decides finally on all Church questions and has the right of deposing Church officers, bishops included. The writer points out at length how completely this law transfers all disciplinary authority—even in such purely spiritual matters as regulation of services, doctrinal teaching, and administration of sacraments—to State officials, who moreover are sure to be influenced by political considerations. And it must be remembered that no Catholics or Evangelicals who really adhere to their professed creed will consent to act on the new Supreme Court, which is charged with final and irresponsible powers, while the Minister of Public Worship is invested with a lay papacy "which is calculated to stamp his personal impression upon the Church to a most perilous extent." The law of May 13 forbids, under severe penalties, the infliction of ecclesiastical censures affecting "the person, property, liberty, or civic repute" of those concerned, or having reference to the doing or contemplating of any act authorized by law, and also forbids any public notice being given of Church censures. On this it is observed that the condition of "civic repute" virtually extends the prohibition to all Church censures whatsoever, and that acts allowed or required by the law may contravene the conscientious convictions of some religionists, as Quakers *e.g.* object to oaths. In summing up the writer remarks that the consequences of these laws for the Roman Church have already been demonstrated. "The Catholic Church is disorganized, and that disorganization is the deepest injury of the German Empire. The clergy are made martyrs and the laity fanatics, and the hearts of Catholics are daily more and more estranged from the Imperial Government and the fatherland." The effect on the Protestant Church will be no less disastrous, and already "the minds of Christian and Conservative citizens are filled with distrust." A common Consistory for the Lutheran, Reformed, and United Churches in the province of Hesse has been imposed by the State, and forty-two pastors, who protested, were ruthlessly deposed. The real conflict of the State is not so much against the Roman Church as against "religion and Christianity," and as long as the Imperial Chancellor retains office, still more serious conflicts are sure to occur. The writer feels confident that the Church will eventually triumph, and the judgments of God will strike the work of the present rulers, but meanwhile a terrible "period of suffering and combat is at hand" for all true Christians. Atheism and Communism are at the doors, and "those who now arrogate to themselves the right of bending conscience to their will may live to learn that he who sows the wind shall reap the whirlwind."

We have not left ourselves much space to comment on this remarkable document, and indeed our chief object has been to present the substance of it to our readers. Nor is much comment needed, when the facts speak for themselves. If this is the verdict of a Protestant pastor, who feels the pressure of the new legislation much less keenly than his Roman Catholic fellow-countrymen, and who regards the Jesuits and the infallible Church with feelings which ought to satisfy Mr. Newdegate, we can hardly wonder that its immediate victims should compare their oppressor to Diocletian and Julian the Apostate. It seems that a Mr. Stokes has just been appealing to the Home Secretary to know whether Professor Tyndall has not incurred the penalty of two years' imprisonment for violating the laws against blasphemy by his recent address to the British Association at Belfast; and in doing so he takes occasion to quote a well-known saying of the first Napoleon, that an atheist is not a man to be argued with, but to be shot. We cannot tell how far Prince Bismarck shares this enthusiastic faith in theism, which he may possibly regard as an objectionably "denominational" tenet, but there can be little doubt that, if he held Napoleon's opinion, he would have little hesitation about acting upon it. Happily there is only one country in Europe at the present day where such a policy as that we have been considering would be tolerated, and probably there is but one living statesman who could have ex-cogitated or would care to enforce it.

HIGH ART FINANCE.

IT must be acknowledged that, from an æsthetic point of view, the speculative finance of the period is not without its merits. The prospectuses which from time to time descend upon us in such abundant showers usually display a bold simplicity and easy finish which indicate the existence of a matured and practised school. The stereotyped criticism, however, which is annually passed on the pictures at the Royal Academy, that they show much skill, but little genius, is perhaps still more applicable to the efforts of financial art. They certainly exhibit plenty of smartness and mechanical dexterity; but the imagination of the artists is confined within conventional grooves, and the standard of invention is undeniably commonplace. Moreover, there is a certain monotony in the continual repetition of the same ideas. First there is a run of mines, and then a run of branch railways; and when one form of ingenuity is worked out, there seems to be nothing for it but to fall back upon the other. The most ordinary mind is equal to the conception of a mine, although a certain sort of cleverness is no doubt required in order to produce a belief in its actual existence. Finance, in fact, has abandoned its flights and has fallen into rather plodding ways. There is a story of a great speculator who floated a Company for working a salt-mine of inexhaustible extent, which turned out to be the sea. But this was in other days. We have none of those strokes of financial genius now, no flights of purely romantic fancy. Even the most notorious of the manufacturers of bubble Companies generally endeavour to work the names of real places and even the names of real people into their advertisements, and the illusions which they seek to create are all of a prosaic turn. A trial, indeed, has just taken place at Dublin which shows that poetry and romance have not yet entirely deserted the cold pavement of the Stock Exchange. It is perhaps unnecessary to enter into the ethics of financial speculation, and it is at least more pleasant to regard it from a purely æsthetic point of view. To some persons it may seem not a particularly noble or elevating pursuit to be engaged in artificial efforts to depreciate other people's property for the purpose of frightening them into selling it at a loss, and those who occupy themselves with such enterprises are usually perfectly aware of what they are about. It appears, however, that an attempt has lately been made by a romantic broker to present the hard facts of the Share-list in a more elegant and engaging form by wreathing them with flowers of literature. A bald, prosaic telegram is received to the following effect:—"Sell ten Berks, ten Novas, ten Calveys, ten Leeds, ten Westerns, and ten Midlands at best, and fifty French"; and it is answered with tropes and metaphors and a gay playfulness of language which would be likely, if anything could, to reconcile even a bear to the triumphant tactics of his enemies the bulls. "On Saturday morning," the broker writes, "the first thing, the bird was a clear 40,000*l.*, even taking into account the heavy loss on those confounded Eries. Surely it was needless to let such a fine specimen of ornithology loose; they are so very rare and highly esteemed in the best museums. However, the English literature!—only fancy consoling a bear with English literature!—"is a noble arsenal, and it says, 'There are bigger fish in the sea than ever came out of it.' So we must arm ourselves with piscatorial consolations against our ornithological mishaps." It must be delightful to have to do with a stock-broker who gilds one's not very pretty projects of material profit with such philosophical and literary lustre. "Saturday morning," he goes on, "left me broken-hearted, as I saw it sailing away on a pink cloud with a diabolical leer." Still he is full of comfort for his client, and suggests that something better must turn up, if only by way of reaction. "The knowing ones are 'bulls,'" and a turn of bulling is apparently prescribed as a change from bearing. It is to be feared that much of this fine writing was thrown away upon the gentleman to whom it was addressed.

In this instance we have a broker endeavouring to beautify and idealize the dull and dingy operations in which he is engaged, but unfortunately the materials with which he has to deal are not of a kind to lend themselves to such treatment. A new Company, however, has just been started which is really in itself a very fine example of the higher order of imaginative finance, and which certainly requires no varnishing. This Company is called "The General Expenditure Assurance Company," and we are told by its promoters that it has been established "for the purpose of assuring the return of all money expended from day to day." It need hardly be said that this object, if it can be carried out, will supply what may be truly described as a long-felt want. Everybody must have been annoyed by that inconvenient peculiarity of expenditure which makes it difficult to pay for anything without parting with the money. Every little boy would like to eat his cake and have it too, and, as he grows up, he would also very much like to combine keeping his money with spending it freely. This new Company will enable him to gratify this desire. An old proverb tells us that a penny saved is a penny gained, but the rule is now to be reversed, and the way to gain money is to spend it. It is in fact a realization in the region of practical finance of the game *qui perd gagne*. It is now placed in our power to attain affluence, not by penurious economy, but by lavish expenditure, and there must be a great many people, we imagine, who find expenditure come much more naturally and easily to them than economy. The Directors of the Company admit that the object they have in view may "at first sight appear astonishing"; but they have satisfied themselves that it is quite practicable, and, "like every great

discovery or scheme, easy and simple in its operation." The way in which it is proposed to relieve society of one of its greatest difficulties is this:—The Company appoints certain tradesmen of every class throughout the kingdom who are to pay a small premium to the Company, and to distribute the Company's coupons free of charge to their customers for the full amount of all purchases made for ready money. As soon as a customer has accumulated 5*l.* in coupons, he will forward them to the Company and will receive in exchange an Assurance Bond for 5*l.*, which the Company undertakes to redeem within a fixed period. Every half-year there will be a ballot of all the bonds issued in the presence of a Notary Public. The bonds which are drawn for redemption will be advertised in the newspapers and paid without deduction. The rest will stand over till the next ballot, and so on. The first series will be limited to 150 ballots, at the last of which ballots every bond not previously redeemed will be paid. That is to say, those who invest their money in this manner are to get it back at the end of seventy-five years, if their bonds are not drawn for redemption at an earlier date. In this way Paterfamilias may console himself with the reflection that the more his household eats and drinks, the more rapidly his youngsters wear out their clothes and boots, the longer his own and his elder sons' tailor's bills, and the milliner's bills of his wife and daughters, the more colossal will be the magnificent fortune which will all the while be steadily accumulating for the benefit of the family.

The explanation of this startling experiment in finance is found upon examination to be, as its promoters admit, extremely simple. It is just this—that the premiums received by the Company from its trade members are to be invested in Government and other securities, and will thus form an accumulative fund, from which all bonds will be redeemed. It is perhaps hardly necessary to point out that this is only a form of discount for cash, in which the payment of discount is postponed for seventy-five years instead of being given at once. If the purchaser of goods at one of the Company's affiliated shops were to invest at once the discount on each transaction, he would of course accumulate for himself the fund which the Company propose to provide him with at a rather remote date. The intervention of the Company would, therefore, appear to be superfluous. One object of the Company would seem to be to attack our proverbial philosophy on several important points, and it is natural that the reversal of "a penny saved is a penny gained" should be followed by a similar adaptation of "a bird in the hand is worth two in the bush." Distrust of the bush is, however, we are afraid, deeply rooted in human nature. It is obvious that the money which is to be provided by the shopkeepers in order to form the Company's accumulative fund must, in the first instance, be extracted from the pockets of customers. In an ordinary way the customer would at once get discount for cash payments, but, instead of this prompt and simple operation, there is to be a circuitous process of allowing the money to lie in the hands of the Company, and to be employed entirely at its discretion, for the best part of a century, on the chance of its being got back again by the descendants of the customer. It is proposed that shopkeepers should pay the Company a premium in order to be entered on their list, and the advantage they are to get in return is that "they will transact their business for cash instead of giving credit." This is an advantage, indeed, which they can enjoy at present, if they choose, without the assistance of the Company. Altogether this new project is a very pretty example of idealized finance, although it is certainly not flattering to the intelligence of the persons to whom it is addressed.

LIABILITY OF RAILWAY COMPANIES FOR DELAY.

THE County Courts offer valuable facilities for enforcing punctuality on Railway Companies. Several decisions have been given in actions brought by passengers, and all, with one exception, have been adverse to the Companies. In the most recent case, the Great Western Railway Company, who were defendants, relied upon a notice prefixed to their time-tables that they would not be accountable for any loss, inconvenience, or injury arising from delay or detention, unless upon proof that it arose "in consequence of the wilful misconduct of the Company's servants." The plaintiff took a first-class ticket from Reading to Henley by the train timed to arrive at Reading at 10.25 and to leave Reading at 10.30, to arrive at Twyford at 10.40 and to leave Twyford at 10.45, and arrive at Henley at 11 A.M. The train arrived at Reading punctually at 10.25, but did not leave Reading till 10.39. On arriving at Twyford the plaintiff found that the train to Henley had just left, and there was no other train for an hour. He took a fly and got to Henley in half an hour. The delay at Reading was occasioned principally by the want of porters to put luggage into the train. The train was a very light one, the plaintiff being the only first-class passenger. The plaintiff, who is a solicitor and treasurer of the County Court of Henley and other places, sued the defendants for 6*s.* 6*d.*, the expense of a fly from Twyford to Henley. The plaintiff admitted that he was cognizant of the notice already quoted.

Upon these facts three questions arose—(1) What was the contract between the Company and the plaintiff? (2) Was that contract affected by the notice? (3) Was the notice itself affected by "wilful misconduct" of the Company's servants?

The answer to the first question is easy. The contract between

the Company and the plaintiff was to convey the plaintiff to Henley in a reasonable time; and the question of reasonable time is no longer left at large, but is fixed by the Company's time-table, subject to accidents which reasonable care could not provide against. This contract arises on the purchase of a ticket, unless it be qualified by the notice; and thus comes the second question, to which the obvious answer is that the notice is *ultra vires* so far as it professes to attach to the right of travelling on the Company's own line the condition that the Company will not be responsible for any shortcoming of their servants not amounting to wilful misconduct. Thus far we have adopted the substance, and almost the exact words, of the judgment given in the Reading County Court, and the answers to the first two questions are enough to decide the case. Upon the third question, whether there was "wilful misconduct" of the Company's servants, the Judge of the County Court thought, "with some doubt," that there was, and here we incline to differ from him; but if he were wrong his error would not affect the soundness of his judgment on the main question. It was stated by the plaintiff, and not denied by the defendants, that "the delay at Reading was occasioned principally by the want of porters to put luggage into the train." It appears to us an abuse of language to say that this delay "arose in consequence of the wilful misconduct of the Company's servants," which are the words of the notice. The porters at Reading are no more able than other people to do two things at one time. If there are not enough porters to do the work of the station, the fault must lie with the managers of the Company or with the Company itself, but in neither case should we think the expression "wilful misconduct" applicable. Upon this point we are not without authority, and it happens to be furnished by another case against the same Company. In this case the plaintiff's goods were placed in a truck to be attached to a train passing the High Wycombe station late at night. The train brought some cattle to the station, and the defendants' servants, in order to prevent the cattle from being kept in their trucks till the next day, drove them into a yard, from which they strayed upon the railway, and upset the train, thereby injuring the plaintiff's goods. The plaintiff had undertaken to relieve the defendants from liability for damage unless it arose from "wilful misconduct" of their servants. When this case came before the Court of Queen's Bench Mr. Justice Blackburn said that there was admittedly no malice in what the servants did, and he agreed that there might be many cases of wilful misconduct without malice, but he did not agree that culpable negligence was necessarily wilful misconduct. The cattle were driven into a yard which communicated with the line. This was not the usual course of proceeding, but the object of doing so on this occasion was to deliver the cattle to their consignees that night. There might have been some neglect by the Company's servants, but "I cannot see," said the learned Judge, "how they can possibly be said to have been guilty of wilful misconduct." There was nothing to show that what they wilfully did—that is, drive the cattle into the yard—was likely to cause injury to the plaintiff's goods, or that they had knowledge of any danger to which they were exposing either the cattle or the train by what they did. Mr. Justice Quain remarked on the difficulty of defining the negligence which amounts to wilful misconduct so as to justify a conviction for manslaughter. "Something of the same kind," he said, "is intended here; but without defining it exactly, it is sufficient that the facts here show no culpable negligence at all, and negligence must be culpable to constitute wilful misconduct."

An appeal is, we believe, intended from the judgment of the Reading County Court, and the Company may rely on the case we have quoted to establish that there was no "wilful misconduct of their servants" causing the plaintiff to be delayed in his arrival at Twyford. But they will thus only show that the notice was not displaced by circumstances, supposing that notice to be otherwise applicable to the plaintiff, and this will be their point of difficulty. These notices, to be valid, must be reasonable. The Company has no power to impose unreasonable conditions on passengers, and the Judge of the County Court has held this condition to be unreasonable, and he is supported by authority in so holding. In an action brought against the Great Eastern Railway Company for delay in starting a train, the defence was that the Company by notice affixed to their time-tables declared that "they would not hold themselves responsible for delay, or any consequences arising therefrom." The plaintiff, a miller living at Framlingham, held a season ticket, and was accustomed to travel to London by the defendants' railway to attend the Mark Lane Corn Market. He came one day to the station at the usual time; the carriages were ready, but the engine had not steam up and could not go. Mr. Baron Martin, who tried the case, made short work with the notice limiting liability. "It is," he said, "mere nonsense for the defendants to say, as in effect they say, 'We will be guilty of any negligence we think fit, and will not be responsible.' It will be observed that in that case the notice was general that the Company would not be responsible for delay; whereas in the present case the Company announce that they will not be responsible for delay, unless caused by the wilful misconduct of their servants. It may be argued, therefore, that the ruling of Mr. Baron Martin in the former case is not an authority for the decision in the latter. There can, however, we think, be little doubt that the notice given by the Great Western Company is invalid. They say that they will only be responsible for wilful misconduct, and, as there may be culpable negligence which is not wilful mis-

conduct, they say in effect that they will not be responsible for such culpable negligence, whereas it is clear that they must be liable.

But it is a different question whether, under the circumstances of this particular case, the defendants' claim to be discharged from their ordinary duty of keeping time would be reasonable, irrespectively of any notice which they may have given. It will of course be conceded that a literal and absolute performance of the undertaking contained in their time-tables could not be exacted from them. Their duty is, as stated by the Judge of the Reading County Court, "to use all reasonable means to convey passengers to their destinations in the reasonable times which they have expressly fixed." The question therefore is, whether they used "all reasonable means" in the present case. It may be allowed that the case is not so strong against the Company as that which came before Mr. Baron Martin. "Here," said he, "a train is advertised, the plaintiff gets to the station, and finds the train there and the engine without steam up—the horse in the stable unharnessed." It was stated in that case that an hour and a half was needed to get steam up. In the present case the want of porters at the Reading station caused a delay of only nine minutes, which caused the plaintiff to miss the train at Twyford. There have been judges on the Bench who have leaned strongly against extending the liability of Railway Companies, and it is not impossible that such a judge might view this case differently from the Judge of the County Court. If the case came before a jury they might probably consider that unnecessary delay at Reading was combined with unnecessary punctuality at Twyford. If the train must wait at Reading because the porters were engaged, it might be thought that the train could wait at Twyford until the train from Reading had arrived. Assuming that the trains on the branch line to Henley are under the control of the defendants, they surely ought to have so managed as to protect the plaintiff from the consequence of delay caused, as was admitted, by the imperfection of their own arrangements at Reading. We think that the view which a jury would be likely to take of the case was fairly expressed by the Judge of the County Court when he said, "It is clear that the absence of porters at the Reading station, which reasonable care might have prevented, occasioned the detention of the plaintiff at Twyford, and as he was able to procure a conveyance by which he got to Henley half an hour sooner than the Railway Company were prepared to convey him by the next train, I think that he was justified in hiring it, and that he is entitled to recover its cost against the defendants."

In another recent case a decision involving the same principle was given in the Burnley County Court against the Lancashire and Yorkshire Railway Company. In that case the Judge held that, although the Company do not guarantee the arrival and departure of the trains at the times stated, and do not hold themselves accountable for any injury which may arise from delay, and "make such terms part of the contract with the passenger," yet they are bound to use all ordinary means within their power to perform their contract; and if they omit to use such means and show no sufficient reason for the omission, they fail to perform the duty which the law imposes upon them of using reasonable care and diligence in conveying the passenger to his destination according to their contract with him. The plaintiff in that case took a ticket at Burnley for Barnsley. The train by which he started ought to have reached Wakefield in time for a train starting from that place for Barnsley. But the train from Burnley to Wakefield was accidentally delayed, and the train started from Wakefield for Barnsley before the plaintiff arrived at Wakefield. It appeared, however, that the plaintiff and other passengers from Burnley arrived at Wakefield soon after the departure of the train for Barnsley, and if the station-master at Wakefield had known that they were coming he would have detained that train for them. An accident had occurred soon after leaving Burnley which rendered it impossible for the passengers from Burnley to reach Wakefield at the usual time. Afterwards an arrangement was made for forwarding these passengers to Wakefield, and if, when this arrangement was made, the station-master at Wakefield had been informed of it, he would have detained the train starting for Barnsley until the Burnley passengers arrived at Wakefield. The Judge of the County Court held that the Railway Company were guilty of negligence in not sending this information by telegraph to Wakefield. As the train for Barnsley had left Wakefield before the plaintiff arrived there, he had to wait several hours for the next train, and thus he arrived at Barnsley too late to do his business, and had to go there on another day, and incurred expense which he now recovered against the Railway Company.

In one of the few reported cases of this kind that have been brought before Judges of the Superior Courts, the plaintiff proved only that it was Whitsun Monday, and the train by which he travelled, being heavy, was late, and he missed an appointment. The late Mr. Justice Crompton held that, without some evidence of negligence, the plaintiff could not recover against the Company. Among the recent cases in which Judges of County Courts have decided against Railway Companies, the best known is that of Mr. Forsyth, M.P. This was a stronger case of delay than that which has given occasion to these remarks, as indeed the Judge of the Reading County Court who decided both cases admitted.

It may not be amiss to observe the light which this discussion throws upon the utility or necessity of that accumulation of reports of cases which is often treated as a reproach to the English law. We have been trying to ascertain what view

Judges are likely to take of complaints against Railway Companies of delay in carrying passengers. There has been a growing disposition to entertain such complaints, and in order to measure this growth we collect as many cases of this class as we can readily find, and compare their features. In order to do this we have recourse to the various legal periodicals which report select cases from the County Courts and rulings of Judges of the Superior Courts sitting at *nisi prius*. All this, be it observed, lies beyond the regular reports of cases in the Superior Courts, of which the bulk is sufficiently alarming. The truth is that the liability of Railway Companies in these cases is being established and defined, and while this process is going on it is necessary to note every word that falls from the Judges who are concerned in what is virtually law-making. It seems, therefore, that not only law reports but also legal periodicals are inevitable, although cumbersome, parts of our legal system.

POACHERS.

WITH those vacation speeches which set in so severely at this time of year there is sure to come a series of reports from the rural districts which are infinitely more sensational. The poachers begin to be out and busy as well as voluble members of Parliament and aspiring politicians on their promotion. The season tempts them, and the state of the covers. There are plenty of tame pheasants about, and the hares have not been much shot down. A good deal of rainy weather, and occasional sharp frosts towards the morning, are beginning to bring down the leaves, so that very soon "of a shiny night," as the old poaching ballad has it, it will not be difficult to distinguish the birds roosting in the branches against the moonlight. And although the regular poaching season has barely commenced, we hear already of a serious encounter in the Herefordshire woods. A party of adventurers came in collision with a force of keepers. Brought to bay, the poachers levelled their guns without intimidating their assailants. There was a desperate hand-to-hand scuffle and several shots were exchanged. Two of the keepers were wounded, more or less seriously. One of the poachers received part of a charge in the head, but, as his friends had the best of the skirmish and carried off their wounded, it is unknown whether the injury was likely to prove fatal.

It is by no means a pleasant thought that encounters of this kind are becoming yearly more common, and are likely to be more frequent still for all we can see to the contrary; in short, that murder must now be regarded as an everyday contingency in a trade to which a good many Englishmen regularly devote a large part of their time. But there can be no question that poaching pays much better than ever it used to pay. The game is more plentiful, there is a constant demand for it, and there are greater facilities of disposing of it to advantage. Now that proprietors breed so much for their annual battues, to take the free run of a well-stocked wood for an hour or so is like the opportunity of filling a bag in a poultry-house. The days which the lord of the manor has fixed for those great events of the year to which his friends and neighbours are bidden are matter of notoriety and nightly talk in all the low public-houses in his vicinity. Till then his young hand-fed birds have not been disturbed; and, entirely unsophisticated as they are, for the poacher it is pretty much a question of fetching them away without interference on the part of their guardians. There are difficulties of course. As the temptations to an onslaught have increased, the defence has been strengthened in proportion. A great breeder of birds and hares seldom shows himself penny-wise by undue economy in the number of his watchers. His keepers' cottages are distributed strategically, so as to command all the favourite resorts of pheasants and poachers. Night patrols are out and on the watch, who are presumed to study the art of surprise by keeping all their movements secret. If the man-traps and spring-guns that used to be advertised everywhere in the plantations are for the most part out of date, modern science has invented ingenious substitutes for them. There are wires arranged a foot or so from the ground, stretched stiffly among the sheltering undergrowth, so as to trip up intruders when they least expect it, with the chance of sending off their guns to the imminent danger of their comrades. And these wires act as so many bell-pulls, to set chimes pealing aloud when silence is eminently desirable. Another ingenious practical repartee to unwelcome intrusions is the dummy pheasants that are fixed up among the boughs in likely places. They betray the illicit sportsman into making much unnecessary noise, and he is lucky if his enemies are not actually watching the lure at the moment he commences his practice. On the other hand, as poachers generally go about preserves in gangs, the watchers must concentrate their forces in order to make a fair match of it, and hence there is an obvious opening for stratagem. False intelligence or a feint at some distant spot draws away the keepers from the real point of the expedition, and the birds they have been carefully rearing are dropped and bagged when their backs are turned. One can sympathize with the growing irritation of men who have repeatedly been tricked in that way by notorious characters as to whose identity they feel no doubt whatever, although they may only have suspicion and indirect evidence to go upon. It is a war of cunning and low intrigue which keeps up bitter feelings on both sides. Ten to one the keepers have secret service money at their disposal, which they lay out judiciously among frequenters

of the village public-houses which are the poachers' houses of call. From time to time they pick up bits of information more or less trustworthy; although probably it is not very often that they succeed in bribing an active accomplice into treachery, for a good poaching connexion is much too lucrative to be risked for the sake of a stray half-sovereign or unlimited ale on some particular evening. In the days of stage-coaches there used to be some difficulty in disposing of the spoil, and the pheasants and hares were sold for what they would fetch to some one who charged exorbitantly for the risk of getting rid of them. Now that there are lines of railway leading in all directions, a light spring-cart carries the booty to a station, where it is stowed in the van as passengers' luggage; or it is consigned to a safe hand in the nearest market town, if not to a salesman in a large way of business in London. There is no tracing stolen property of this kind, or identifying the missing goods by making a descent on the receiver's premises. The money is duly remitted in exchange for the consignment; nor is much discount exacted on account of the illicit nature of the transaction. There is keen competition for supplies among the dealers, and we fear that the maxim of many of them is to ask no questions. In short, to reckless vagabonds of sporting tastes poaching would offer irresistible attractions were it only somewhat safer. As it is, the balance of objections to it is scarcely sufficient to deter the neophyte when once he has broken ground and been encouraged by a certain impunity. It is true that, to say nothing of the chance of being shot, it is not an agreeable dilemma to be reduced to choose between giving up your gun and your liberty or perpetrating murder. But then there are drawbacks to all trades; and the poacher may flatter himself that, with ordinary luck, he may run a long and prosperous career, indulging his inclinations for dissipation like his betters, with the minimum of honest exertion.

England has no special reason to be proud of her poachers, and there is very little romance about them. There are countries in which the poacher, in spite of a certain moral obliquity in his vision, is distinguished by his free and manly bearing. He is the pleasantest of all companions in his native mountains, and is so far an estimable member of society that you may safely trust him with anything but game. Readers of Mr. Bonar's book of sports in the Bavarian Highlands will remember the close friendships he formed with the "free shots" who took toll of the famous hunting-grounds there. Although they had the bloodthirsty habit of taking quiet aim at keepers whenever they sighted them, they were admirable as husbands, fathers, and in the domestic relations generally. They needed steady nerves and hands for their dangerous calling, and, so far as strict temperance went, they lived like anchorites, except on special occasions. So much could hardly be said for our own Highlanders, who used to stalk in the Scotch deer-forests as regularly as the legitimate owners. Living a life of rough exposure in their damp climate, they drank even more freely than their neighbours, arranging their nightly bivouacs when they could at one of those illicit stills which used to be so many centres of conviviality in the moorlands. But they had firm principles of their own, and a standard of respectability to which they acted up. They killed deer as their ancestors, the caterans, lifted cattle. A misadventure might chance to a keeper in fair stand-up fight, and they might make free with their rifles or their hunting-knives when their blood was up; but they would have scorned to shoot a man from an ambush, or to take advantage of superior strength or numbers to maltreat a man wantonly when he was only doing his duty to his master. Except for drinking as much as he can get, the low-country poacher is just the reverse of all this. He is essentially a sneak. He goes about during the day with a hangdog expression that gives him a strong family resemblance to the down-looking lurcher he has left tied up at home. Not that he shows himself abroad in the daylight more than is necessary, and when you do get a glimpse of him, he is generally on the lounge. But, like Mr. Silas Wegg in *Our Mutual Friend*, he "takes a powerful sight of notice" in his own underhand way. He goes sauntering down lanes under cover of the hedgerows, past likely woods, listening to the crowing of the peasants; or he leans over a gate with hands in pockets and pipe in mouth, contemplating abstractedly the gambols of the hares. He starts and shambles on at the sound of a footstep, and has a slouch in his shoulders and a wriggle in his gait as if he were momentarily expecting a hand on his coat-collar. He is like a beast of the night compelled against his instinct to be abroad in the sunshine. Although he passes a good part of his days and nights in the open air, his face has a sodden, unhealthy tinge, and when he does raise his eyes you can see they are bloodshot. For the best part of his gains go in the public-house, where he and his comrades lay their heads together, blaspheming and whispering over pipes and pots. Naturally he is dissipated, for it is a necessity of his business to be thrown into company as bad as himself, or worse; and he primes himself with drugged malt liquors and fiery alcohol for his long excursions and vigils in the night air. He needs Dutch courage, too; for going after lawless objects in the stillness and the darkness, with the not improbable contingency of being left crippled in a ditch or carried home on a shutter, would shake even stronger nerves than debauchery has left him. Sneaking about in constant apprehension or terror, he is of course savage when not sullen, and naturally he will maul a prostrate enemy remorselessly if he gets the chance. But it is his wife and family who have the worst of it, should he happen unluckily to be head of a household. It is not difficult to imagine what a home

his must be, when he seldom comes back to it except after a carouse or a fagging and anxious expedition. His family suffer alike by his good or his bad fortune. His example is bad enough for the parish in general, but what must it be for the boys who grow up under his roof? Something may be done perhaps now that schooling is enforced by statute; but vices propagate themselves more easily than virtues, and ill weeds proverbially spread and flourish. If opportunity makes the poacher even more than it makes other criminals, we cannot have much hope of the class diminishing so long as battues and high preserving are on the increase, and railways everywhere place preserves in the country in communication with the mining districts and the slums of manufacturing towns. And it can hardly fail to be largely recruited if strikes and lock-outs among the agriculturists throw able-bodied labourers out of work.

THE USES OF REGALIA.

SIR WILFRID LAWSON, who has a keen sense of the ridiculous, could not in a recent speech resist the temptation to have a hit at the absurd and fantastic parade with which a considerable section of his supporters think it necessary to carry on their agitation. He suggested that it was possible to protest against the liquor trade quite as effectually in a shooting-coat as in cloaks and sashes of many colours. It may be doubted, however, whether Sir Wilfrid would seriously desire that his admonition should be taken to heart, and that the Good Templars, Rechabites, and others should strip themselves of their finery. He would be glad, no doubt, if this foolish part of the business could be made less conspicuous, but he has probably a sufficient acquaintance with human nature to be aware of the danger of depriving his friends of one of the chief attractions of their propaganda. Any one who imagines that the decorations of the Templars are only an accidental superfluity must have an exceedingly imperfect conception of the real character of that body. The truth is that the regalia, as they are called, constitute the very heart and essence of the organization, which might perhaps contrive to exist with the help of the tinsel and coloured scarfs if teetotalism were abandoned for some other cry, but would be tolerably certain to decline if the stimulant of ornaments and titles were by any chance to be withdrawn. We say this of course without meaning to throw any doubt on the sincerity of the Templars. They are probably very anxious that total abstinence should be enforced, but when their enthusiasm on the subject is analysed, it will be found that a large part of it may be traced to enjoyment of the public parade for which an opportunity is thus afforded. Good Templarism would be a very dull affair without its badges, and flags, and orders of officers. The literature of the sect or order shows plainly enough the importance which is attached, and no doubt justly, to this part of the business. One of the principal by-laws of the Grand Lodge enacts that "it is imperative that regalia be worn in every meeting of the order at which any part of our ceremonial or unwritten work is used," but members are at liberty to appear in either officer's, Sub-lodge, Degree, or Grand Lodge regalia, as they may prefer. In one of the Templar newspapers we find a number of regalia-makers advertising their goods, and the manufacture of this new sort of Brummagem ware appears to have already become a large and prosperous trade. An officer's set of regalia costs, it seems, from 2*l.* to 5*l.*; an ordinary member's set in white from 5*s.* to 12*s.* the dozen; the second degree from 2*s.* to 10*s.* 6*d.* each; the third degree from 4*s.* to 2*l.* each; the Lodge from 1*l.* to 3*l.* each. It is significant that even children are turned to account as wearers of regalia, a set for an officer of this class running up as high as 30*s.* Another tradesman advertises "the largest and most varied stock of laces, braids, stars, fringe, gimp, tassels, rosettes, emblems, and every requisite for persons making up their own regalia—Bright! Cheap! and New!" and, considering the number of Good Templars throughout the country, a great impetus must have been lately given to the trade in this sort of frippery. The flag-makers, too, have reason to be grateful to the Templars, who cannot get on without plenty of bunting. There is an "official T.O.G. flag," but members have also the fullest liberty to indulge their own tastes in regard to flags and banners. Since Father Mathew's day most of the Teetotalers have had a passion for medals, and this fashion seems to be as popular as ever. There is a large variety of "star, Maltese cross, and other badges," with which the Templars may decorate themselves at pleasure.

It will be seen therefore that a Good Templar is marked off from ordinary humanity not only by his peculiar views as to abstinence, and a proud consciousness of moral superiority, but also by great splendour of personal appearance. We suppose that it is only on public occasions that he comes forth roped about with sham gold fringe and worsted tassels, and glittering with medals, Maltese crosses, and all sorts of regalia in brass or tinsel; but there is no reason why he should not always go about in this way if he finds it agreeable. We are accustomed to hear complaints of the dulness and want of colour in English life, and some foreign visitors have been disposed to attribute to this cause much of the intemperance of the people; but this deficiency would be supplied if the Templars would only be good enough to bring a little of their gorgeousness into everyday use. As for the Templars themselves, although they do not sleep in their finery, the consciousness that they possess it probably never quits them for an instant, and gives them a sweet and constant sense of their own

importance. It is not merely the glare and glitter of the baubles that fascinates them, but the feeling that these things serve to distinguish the wearers from the common herd, and to place them on a more conspicuous social platform. However foolish the working-men and small shopkeepers who trick themselves out in this fantastic style may look, it must be admitted that this is a sort of folly of which they by no means enjoy a monopoly. In this instance the Good Templars have merely followed the example of the Freemasons and Foresters, who employ for convivial purposes the ceremonial and decorations which the Templars have now imitated as a means of promoting the cause of temperance.

The truth is that this sort of parade would seem to correspond to certain innate cravings of human nature which are common to most of us. Nobody is content to settle down quietly in the undistinguishable ruck of utterly obscure and insignificant humanity. To be a little higher or bigger, or at least more conspicuous, than one's neighbour is the great object of life; no matter how little the difference may be, it is always better than nothing. If a man has but a sheet of tissue-paper under his feet while there are other men standing on the bare ground, that is always something to be proud of as far as it goes. Even the savage takes pleasure in his stripes of paint or necklace of shells, not so much on account of their brilliant effect as on account of the sense which he has that they mark him off, if only to the extent of half a stripe or a single shell, as superior to some other barbarian. As the constitution of society becomes more democratic, the process of levelling provokes a natural reaction. The impression which some travellers have brought away from the United States, that in that country all attorneys are *ex officio* major-generals, though inaccurate in itself, is explained by the eagerness with which military distinctions are sought after by persons who otherwise would only be known by their names over their shop or office doors. In our own country the classes who are supposed to be pining for the abolition of the House of Lords can find no better way of consoling themselves in the meantime than by inventing titles and badges for their own use. The various degrees of membership and grades of officers among the Good Templars are doubtless much more attractive than the mere splendour of the insignia. If all the members held precisely the same rank, and wore the same uniform, they would enjoy the satisfaction of reflecting that at least they were entitled to hold their heads a trifle higher than the people outside who had no regalia; but the chance of rising to a higher grade in their own body exercises a much stronger and more insinuating fascination. We have no idea what may be the exact numbers of the Good Templars, but there can be no doubt that they must amount to many thousands. A year or two since, before this organization was invented or imported, all these people were languishing on a dead-level of dull obscurity. They lived, talked, dressed, and went about their business exactly like the rest of the great body of common people all over the country. All of a sudden the wave of Templarism has elevated them, be it ever so little, above the ordinary and commonplace multitude. They have flags, a fancy dress, and a jargon of their own. They can look down on people who are destitute of regalia, and whose low existence is not cheered and dignified by the prospect of possibly rising some day to be a W.C., a P.W.M., a W.V.C.T., or even a P.G.W.V.T. It may be supposed then that they are happier in proportion to their increased sense of their own self-importance and their superiority, if only by some infinitesimal fraction of an inch, over the rest of the community whose insignificance is so extreme that they are not even Templars. And if they really are made happier by this reflection, it may at least be said that it is, on the whole, a very cheap and innocent pleasure, and nobody else is any the worse for it. It is surely much better for working-men to spend their money in tinfoil and Brummagem bullion than in drinking vitriolized gin and hocussed beer. At the same time, there is no use in ignoring the fact that the success of the Templars is not exclusively due to pure philosophical enthusiasm.

The rapid development of Good Templarism in this country appears to supply an instructive lesson as to the means by which a cry of any kind may be made popular with the multitude. In the first place, the mere cry itself goes for something, because it bestows on those who cry it a distinctive character, and this is a little lift out of the ruck. Then there are the regalia, and the flags, and the medals, which are the outward and visible symbols of the new communion, and the grades of rank which every one may hope to scale. Nor is this all. The Templars have several weekly organs, in which portraits and biographies—the latter, it should be said, more flattering than the former—are given of the most distinguished—that is, most fussy and active—members of the body. To any one who has been oppressed by a sense of being utterly lost and confounded in a vast mass of people, all as common and undistinguishable as himself, it must be like the opening of heaven to find himself mentioned even in the most obscure of periodicals. And here it may be observed how trading interests come into play. Good Templarism has supplied an opening for various industrial enterprises in the way of newspapers, regalia, flags and banners, medals, and so on. There are Templar grocers, and printers, and hand-bell ringers, and a Templar Trade List is about to be published. A Life Assurance Office also pays special court to the Templars. It is perhaps only natural that the Templars should hold together in this way, and patronize each other. They will of course push the movement that gives them a new importance to the best of their power, and all the tradesmen

who are making a good thing out of it may be trusted to push it too. Templarism, in short, derives its strength, not so much from anything in the nature of its principles as from the skilful adaptation of its machinery to the wants and weaknesses of common humanity. The agencies which drag it might readily be harnessed to any other caravan. As the great Liberal party is still apparently much distracted as to the means of getting itself moved on a little, it is surprising that its managers should fail to observe the advantages which they might derive from taking a leaf from the Good Templars' book. The plan has been proposed of feeding up sound middle-class Liberals in clubs provided for the purpose with all the delicacies of the season and the choicest liquors, selected by committees of noblemen and gentlemen of the highest distinction. But perhaps the working classes might be more readily got at, and, from their numbers, they would be better worth having. All that would seem to be wanting is the invention of a dazzling set of Liberal regalia of the best tinfoil, with a corresponding hierarchy of W.O.'s and P.W.M.'s.

THE CAMBRIDGESHIRE.

THE Cambridgeshire seems to increase in popularity every year. The distance is just suited to the capacities of the greater number of racehorses in these degenerate days; the opportunities for speculation are so great, owing to the large number of competitors, that any horse in the race may be backed to win a fortune—and that consideration alone is unfortunately a sufficient inducement to make the present generation of owners of racehorses regard the Cambridgeshire with especial favour; and, lastly, there are usually so many false starts, so many disappointments during the race itself, and so much depending on getting off quickly and well at the fall of the flag, that the last of the great autumn handicaps at headquarters has come to be looked on as more of a lottery than any other event of the racing season, and, according to popular conviction, the issue of the contest is much more a matter of luck than of merit. We are not altogether satisfied that this popular conviction is well founded. On the contrary, experience would lead one to draw the paradoxical conclusion that the most uncertain race of the year not unfrequently resolves itself into an absolute certainty. Four years ago Adonis was a certainty; a year or two later Allbrook seemed equally a certainty, though the race was just lost by mischance; and this year Peut-Etre's public trials during the Second October Meeting left no doubt that, if he did not tumble down, the Cambridgeshire was at his mercy. And, as he did not tumble down, the confidence reposed in him was amply justified; for, though opposed by as brilliant a handicap field as could possibly be collected, he won from start to finish without ever having to be called upon for an effort. It is a fact that there are races without number at Newmarket in which only three or four competitors take part, and of which it is more difficult to pick the winners than of the Cambridgeshire with its forty runners, when among them is an Adonis or a Peut-Etre. Nothing could be more decisive than the form shown by Peut-Etre in the Second October Meeting. It is true he was only fourth in the Cesarewitch; but it turned out that he was saddled so late that he had to be galloped at full speed from the birdage to the starting-post—a distance of two miles and more—and that he only just arrived in time to take part in the race. Defeat, under such circumstances, was not only excusable but inevitable. But, two days later, he won the Queen's Plate in a canter from Lily Agnes, presumably about the best three-year-old in training, Lillian, and Thunder; and again, on the following day, he beat Leolinus, Trent, Spectator, and Lacy, over the last mile and a half of the Beacon course. By these successes Peut-Etre incurred no penalty for the Cambridgeshire, for which his weight remained at 6 st. 10 lbs., or 18 lbs. less than was carried by horses of his own age, such as Lemnos and Newry. Having proved himself the superior, at even weights, of such tried public performers as Lily Agnes, Trent, and Leolinus, he had now only to fulfil his concluding engagement with a feather weight—a feather weight for a first-class horse, we mean—on his back. The Cambridgeshire is a wonderfully popular race with Continental sportsmen; and they not only enter their horses freely in it, but they are nearly always formidable in it. In recent years it has been won three times by foreign horses; in 1861 by Palestro, in 1870 by Adonis, and in 1873 by Montargis. Within the same period French horses have also run second on three occasions, Gabrielle d'Estrée in 1861, Cerdagne in 1869, and Finisterre in 1872. And this year Peut-Etre has won for the foreigners their fourth and their most easily secured Cambridgeshire. These continued successes will probably cause the handicapper in future to be cautious how he admits the French horses into their favourite race on lenient terms.

The popularity of the Cambridgeshire is shown by the fact that out of 189 subscribers only 58 declined to accept the handicapper's judgment of their representatives; while, despite the astounding revelation of Peut-Etre's true form a fortnight before the race, as many as forty-two horses came to the post. As we have said, they formed an exceptionally brilliant field, and it may be worth while to glance at its composition. The horses over four years of age were represented by Finisterre, Laburnum, Khédive, Curate, Pearl, and Restless; and all of these were leniently weighted, for only once has the Cambridgeshire been won by an old horse. Old horses, in truth, seldom retain that dash of speed so essential in a

mile race. As they grow older, they get more pottering, as well as cunning enough to give up a struggle when fairly collared. Of the five-year-olds and upwards just mentioned Laburnum has been long known as a rogue on whom no dependence can be placed, and The Curate is one of those phantom horses who are always going to do a great thing, and who never do it. Yet one of this lot, Khédive, was so influentially supported that at last he supplanted Peut-Etre in the quotations, and actually started first favourite. It was currently reported that he had won such an extraordinary trial with Pearl that the latter could not win the Cambridgeshire with 4 st. on her back; and when Pearl won the Cambridgeshire Trial Handicap last Monday in a canter from Lacy and seven others, her stable companion Khédive naturally came into favour for the great race of the week. As a three-year-old Khédive showed fine form by running Queen's Messenger to a neck in the Prince of Wales's Stakes at Ascot, and at the sale of Lord Zetland's horses he was purchased for a large sum by Mr. Chaplin. But he has been long in retirement, and was believed to be unsound. After he appeared on the course we are astonished that he still retained his pride of place as first favourite; for he looked only half trained, and those who had seen him earlier in the day declared that he was lame and would turn out a second Mornington. They were not far wrong, for though he did not actually break down in the race, he never showed prominently in it, and a quarter of a mile from home was hopelessly beaten. The danger of trusting to infirm or bottled-up horses has been again strikingly illustrated in this year's Cesarewitch and Cambridgeshire. The four-year-olds formed a most powerful division of the field, and included many animals with considerable claims to notice. At their head was that great horse Lowlander, whose brilliant exploits at Ascot fully entitled him to the honour of being top weight in the handicap. At Goodwood, it is true, he showed but indifferently, yet the handicapper preferred to consider his Ascot victories before his Goodwood defeats; and it would be well if this principle of estimating a horse according to his best, not his worst, performances was more generally adopted. The four-year-olds also included Montargis, winner of the Cambridgeshire in 1873, and by many still considered the best of the French division; Franc-tireur, Hochstapler, Gamecock (third in the Cesarewitch), Flower of Dorset, Hessleden, and His Grace. The last named, who was let in at the low weight of 5 st. 10 lbs., was in the late Baron Rothschild's stables, and has subsequently, it is said, been used as a hack. So highly had he been tried with Walnut that the second in last year's Cambridgeshire, though by no means unduly weighted, was withdrawn in his favour. But he never was formidable in the race, and the fallacy of private trials received another illustration. Lowlander, Gamecock, and His Grace were generally considered the pick of the four-year-olds, but as the third in the Cesarewitch was suspected of being lame, and Lowlander's weight was more than had ever been carried to victory up the Cambridgeshire hill, His Grace was really the champion of this division of the field. The three-year-olds were a most formidable lot, and in addition to Peut-Etre we may mention Aventurière, the winner of the Cesarewitch, Lemnos, and Newry—the last one of the finest-looking horses at Newmarket—Benedictine, asserted to be the equal of Lily Agnes, and for a long time first favourite for the Cambridgeshire, Novateur and La Courouse, Mr. Winkle and Mignonette. It had been confidently asserted that the last named was as good as, if not better than, Peut-Etre; but it seldom happens that there are two wonders in a stable at the same time. Both Lemnos and Newry were giving Peut-Etre 18 lbs., but despite such a disadvantage in weight the splendid appearance of Newry gained him many friends.

There is usually a long delay at the start for the Cambridgeshire, and a good many horses are started on the strength of the chapter of accidents which may happen at the post; but this year the principal delay was in the weighing-out department. It was very late before the numbers were hoisted; and even then the names of the riders were not exhibited at all. This was a great disappointment to a large number of racegoers, who habitually back jockeys' mounts, and reflects little credit on those who manage the details of business at the headquarters of racing. No one, for instance, knew exactly who was riding Peut-Etre, whose trainer had some difficulty in securing a jockey. As it happened, he was ridden by a comparatively unknown lad, and this circumstance, had it been known, would have probably driven the horse back in the market several points. In justice to the rider of Peut-Etre let us say that he did exactly what he ought to have done. All he had to do was to sit perfectly still and let his horse win, and this he did. We have seen a Cambridgeshire lost through a jockey beginning to flourish about when the race was in his hands, but the lad who rode Peut-Etre last Tuesday attended steadily to his duty without playing any tricks or attempting any show. The race was set at half-past two, a convenient hour, but even then a grey haze had spread over the flat, and prevented the spectators in the neighbourhood of the winning-post from obtaining any view of the competitors till they had fairly reached the crest of the hill. We shall not attempt, therefore, to give any detailed description of the race, but we may mention that, after an unusually short detention at the post, the starter was enabled to despatch the forty-two runners, and, as we are informed, on equal terms. We, like nine-tenths of the spectators, could see nothing whatever of the race except in the last quarter of a mile, and then there was little to see except that it was all over. Peut-Etre had decisively beaten everything, and had only to go on at his leisure and pass the judge's box two

lengths ahead of his nearest opponent. Lowlander made one grand struggle for the mastery at the top of the hill, but the weight was too much for him, and he was not ridden out for a place. The place honours were obtained by two extreme outsiders, Chieftain and Lord Gowran, but Lowlander and Aventurière were probably second and third best in the race. Khédive and His Grace were among the first beaten, and it was such a case of hare and hounds in the last quarter of a mile that a great number of horses were not unnecessarily persevered with.

REVIEWS.

GREEN AND GROSE'S HUME.*

THE present editors of Hume's *Treatise on Human Nature* take a somewhat peculiar course. They consider Hume to have been the last great English philosopher, and the study of Hume to be a matter of exceeding importance. But his greatness consists in their eyes simply in the thorough fearlessness with which he carried out Locke's principles till they stood self-condemned; and the important thing to be known by studying him is the final *reductio ad absurdum* of empirical philosophy. Accordingly Mr. Green's introduction to these volumes is not an exposition as we understand the term; for an expounder is one who puts himself, for the time at least, in the author's place and tries to assimilate his thought that he may help others to assimilate it. What we have here is a controversial critique from the transcendental point of view. We have reasons which will presently appear for doubting whether, even from that point of view, it was altogether advisable to do this particular piece of work. Apart from these doubts, Mr. Green seems to have done it with much diligence and ability, and not without the true speculative faculty that sees through half-answers. It is dangerous, however, to make sure that one understands another man's philosophical criticism, especially when one entirely disagrees with him on the fundamental questions of philosophy. Seeing that we have the misfortune so to disagree with Mr. Green, we think it best to say at once that we have often found his writing hard to understand, and that it is very possible that in sundry places we have misunderstood him. Or rather let us say that the root of the whole difference between the empirical and the transcendental philosophy is in truth a misunderstanding not to be removed by argument. The discussion of all the disputed points comes round to this at last. The transcendentalist says there must be an explanation of everything, and defies the empiric to explain the nature of things. He asks:—"Why do you not explain this and that? You stand confused before the necessities of thought, and I cannot understand how you pretend to get on by the mere light of finite experience." The empiric answers to this effect:—"I do not explain this and that because at present I cannot; moreover, for all I know, there may be no explanation at all. If you ask me why some things appear at present inexplicable, I can only say, according to the nature of the case, either that the question is unmeaning, or that I do not know; and if you find any amusement in asking me why I don't know, and so on *ad infinitum*, you are very welcome. In the meantime my finite experience gives me light enough to do my work by, and I let your necessities of thought take care of themselves." From the metempirical point of view, the worth of empirical inquiry is that it leads to glaring contradictions which drive one to take refuge in transcendental ways of thinking; from the empirical point of view, the worth of metempirical criticism is that it drives one to cast off all remnants of metempirical thinking and confine oneself strictly to answering intelligible questions in terms warranted by experience. However, when we come to arguing in detail, the fundamental opposition is easily lost sight of or obscured; hence there is much confusion and fighting at cross purposes. One adversary challenges another to prove something which is alleged by that other to be above proof, or to disprove something which is alleged to be unmeaning; and they minutely criticize each other's solutions without reflecting that they are speaking of different things all the while, inasmuch as they are hopelessly at variance as to the form in which the problem should be stated.

It seems to us that Mr. Green's dialectic is not free from this kind of irrelevance, which practically amounts to unfairness. For it is quite fair to put a question in your own way; but when a man tells you he cannot answer it in that way, and goes on to put a question superficially like it in his way, it is not fair to complain of the answer he ultimately gets for being an answer to his question and not to yours. Now Hume is, on the whole, as explicit as most writers in telling us what sort of questions he does not mean to answer. But Mr. Green's criticism often slides unconsciously from dealing with the sufficiency of Hume's results as answers to Hume's questions into dealing with their sufficiency as answers to Mr. Green's questions. And, if not quite fair to Hume, this is still less fair to empirical philosophy, which now claims to explain definitely many things which Hume could not but leave indefinite, and some things which he could not explain at all. It is curious that Mr. Green takes no

notice whatever of these modern developments, beyond a general statement to the effect that Hume's followers have done nothing but beat about the bush and attempt to escape from his conclusions, and an obscure allusion to a "rougher battery" opened on popular psychology by the physiologists. For anything that appears in the discussion, Mr. Green might never have heard the names of Herbert Spencer, Darwin, or Lewes. As editor of Hume he is indeed not bound to know more than Hume did; but as a controversial writer with Hume for text he stands otherwise. Probably he would say that the empirical philosophers we have named have added no real speculative elements to the dispute. But this is the very point which we call on the transcendentalists to make good. Of course we are not surprised when incompetent writers prefer marching over the ground their enemy held the day before yesterday to attacking the position he holds to-day. But we confess to some surprise when we find a serious and competent person like Mr. Green even seeming to do such a thing. Not that we think it would be impossible to answer a good deal of Mr. Green's criticism without going beyond Hume, though it would be a delicate and difficult task. Many objections are, as we have said, only restatements of the fundamental difference between the two ways of thinking; and at most of the places where modern thinkers would call in the doctrine of evolution, we conceive that Hume could have said (if he did not actually say):—"This is one of the things I do not pretend to explain. I do not say that there will not be an explanation of it some day." And at such places we should so far agree with Mr. Green as to think that Hume was perfectly right in not attempting any explanation at the time. However, we can here undertake no more than to state in our own way the remarks which occur to us on some of Mr. Green's arguments. We can find no room to deal with the introduction to the second volume, which concerns the moral part of the treatise; nor do we much regret it, since the conditions of ethical controversy are now so transformed by the theory of evolution that minute discussion of the older forms of empirical morality is not likely to be very profitable for the future. We will first take a passage which appears to put Mr. Green's general habit of thinking in a fairly clear and compact form:—

The quarrel of the physiologist with the metaphysician is, in fact, due to an *ignorantia elenchi* on the part of the former, for which the behaviour of English "metaphysicians," in attempting to assimilate their own procedure to that of the natural philosophers, and thus to win the popular acceptance which these alone can fairly look for, has afforded too much excuse. The question really at issue is not between two co-ordinate sciences, as if a theory of the human body were claiming also to be a theory of the human soul, and the theory of the soul were resisting the aggression. The question is, whether the conceptions which all the departmental sciences alike presuppose shall have an account given of them or no. For dispensing with such an account altogether (life being short) there is much to be said, if only men would or could dispense with it; but the physiologist, when he claims that his science should supersede metaphysics, is not dispensing with it, but rendering it in a preposterous way. He accounts for the formal conceptions in question, in other words for thought as it is common to all the sciences, as sequent upon the antecedent facts which his science ascertains—the facts of the animal organization. But these conceptions—the relations of cause and effect, &c.—are necessary to constitute the facts. They are not an *ex post facto* interpretation of them, but an interpretation without which there would be no ascertainable facts at all. To account for them, therefore, as the result of the facts is to proceed as a geologist would do, who should treat the present conformation of the earth as the result of a certain series of past events, and yet, in describing these, should assume the present conformation as a determining element in each.

To begin with the end of this, the simile does not go on all fours, as indeed no physical simile in metaphysical matters ever does. It is made plausible by a tacit substitution of *each* for *the description of each*. With the latter reading we can at once accept the proposed absurdity as true. The geologist must think and speak in language, and we admit, or rather maintain, that the present conformation of the earth (as we may practically call it) has been a determining element in the formation of language. If the earth were not what it is, man and his language would not be what they are. We must think of and describe the past world in terms of the present world. We cannot tell how it looked to its lords and masters the monstrous efts, but only how it would have looked to us if we had been there to see. We cannot look forward or backward without carrying our present organized thought with us. Our conception of the world before man existed may be called a fiction in Hume's sense, or, as Mr. Lewes has it, an ideal construction; and yet it is true, for it accounts for our past and present experience, and enables us to predict future experience. Taking the simile thus, we have really dealt with Mr. Green's main objection in the form of a particular case. For the gist of the objection, as we take it, comes to this—we cannot state the facts of psychology on the empirical hypothesis except in terms which are themselves determined by the facts. This is perfectly true. No empirical thinker will now deny that we inherit a highly organized mind, and that a great part of our thinking has been settled for us by our ancestors, or, to speak more accurately, by the mutual reactions of ancestral organisms and their environment. We profess only to give what may be called an historical account of the manner in which our present habits of thought came to be organized; and we admit that for the purposes of this account we must assume the popular belief in an external world. Thereupon the transcendentalist turns round upon us and tells us (as Mr. Green does elsewhere) that our world is "an arbitrary fiction," and our science "a mere language, well or ill constructed, but unaccountably and without reference to things." Having committed ourselves too far to be frightened by epigrams, we reply that the fiction is in practice found to be useful. Moreover, the fiction is not

* *The Philosophical Works of David Hume*. Edited by T. H. Green, Fellow and Tutor of Balliol College, Oxford, and T. H. Grose, Fellow and Tutor of Queen's College, Oxford. Vols. I and II. (*A Treatise on Human Nature, &c.*) London: Longmans & Co. 1874.

arbitrary, the science is well and not ill constructed, just in so far as it is constructed accountably and with reference to experience. If we are asked why it occurs to us to assume a real world, we can only give another historical answer. As a matter of fact, man has for countless generations been a social animal; and the belief in conscious life other than his own individual life, and consequently in a real world common to his life and others—the world in which you and I get on together—is now deeply rooted in every man's mental organism. We frankly concede that it is impossible by mere force of logic to prove to any one that there is anything real outside his own mind. In short, assuming a real world, we claim to be in a fair way to show how our thought has become organized in the world, and how the world, as we know it, is again modified by our organized thought. All this, as it seems to us, is rather beside the purely metaphysical question of the external world, save that it helps one to see, as Hume clearly saw without our present helps, that the only rational form of putting that question is the subjective one. The question, Do external things really exist? or, Why do things exist? is idle and unintelligible; the question, What do we mean by *existence* or *external reality*? is intelligible.

This last is, in truth, the question which Berkeley set himself to answer, and went far towards answering rightly. This seems the best place to say that we distinctly claim Berkeley as an empirical philosopher. Even Berkeley's notion of spirit is not a transcendental assumption, but something which he thought he could find in experience. Mr. Green seems willing to let us have him, for he speaks of Berkeley with very slight respect. He blames Berkeley (so far as we can understand) for not having answered the other or wrongly put question; this we have already pointed out as the general form which transcendental criticism of empirical thinkers is apt to assume. In fact, Mr. Green repeatedly says in different words that Locke, Berkeley, or Hume, as the case may be, does not assign any reason why there should be any order of nature or why it should be what it is rather than anything else. For our part, we see no speculative way to finding such reasons, and we are content to say with Spinoza (whom we also claim as an empiric in all material points) that the order of nature as a whole is ultimate and inexplicable. We have now tried to show in outline our general dissent from Mr. Green's mode of thought; and, having done so, we hope to be the better understood when we go on another time to more particular comment.

SAMUEL LOVER.*

WE know not now many of our readers will be familiar with the name of Samuel Lover, or will remember anything more than that he was the author of certain popular songs, and of a novel or two of what is called Irish humour. In addition to these claims to reputation, Mr. Lover was also an industrious miniature-painter; and for some time gave one of those "entertainments," after the precedent of Mathews, which have been popular both in England and America. If such a man had been allowed to pass away without any record of his activities being preserved for the benefit of posterity, we cannot say that we should have been sensible of a great literary void. Men of higher reputation are still in want of a biography. Mr. Bayle Bernard, however, is of opinion that a biography is needed. Mr. Lover, he tells us, was a "poet, novelist, dramatist, painter, etcher, and composer"; and this "variety of gift" was "the directest challenge to that division of labour principle which forms the law of modern excellence." It might possibly be said that the result of the challenge was not favourable to the challenger; for Mr. Lover can hardly be described by his warmest admirer as a leader in any department of artistic excellence. Mr. Bernard, however, has his answer. Genius, he admits, generally implies concentration. But it may also be "diffusive." "Power may diminish with diversity, but it is a phenomenon after all that only divides in its particulars to reunite in its sum. Such was the case with Lover." We must admit that after some reflection we are unable to assign any meaning whatever to this remarkable sentence. If it meant to say that a man who is a third-rate novelist, a third-rate poet, and a third-rate artist is thereby entitled to be called a first-rate man of genius, the meaning would be obviously absurd. And yet we are unable to suggest any other meaning at all relevant to the question.

The conclusion is, anyhow, that Mr. Bernard resolved to write a book. He found, however, on inquiry that materials for it were wanting. Mr. Lover had left no letters, no papers, and no journal worth mentioning, and had only just begun to write some reminiscences of his childhood. Mr. Bernard found therefore that his whole materials reduced themselves to an article in the *Dublin University Magazine*, written a good many years before Mr. Lover's death, another sketch by a connexion, making some remarks upon the article, the fragmentary reminiscences, and the "domestic memoranda" which he calls journals. In other words, he had substantially no materials at all except an old magazine article. Mr. Bernard, however, was not to be daunted by such a trifle. "It is obvious," he says, that the documents described "required considerable addition and connexion to give them the substance and interest which a biography demands." In other words, as Mr. Bernard was determined to prepare a dish without any meat, he had to make it entirely of sauce. Such literary

cookery may succeed at times in skilful hands; though it is hardly fair to call the result a biography. Mr. Bernard, however, had known Mr. Lover for a good many years; he had taken an interest in Irish novels and songs, and he had been to America. With the qualifications thus naively described he has put together between three and four hundred pages more or less distinctly referring to Mr. Lover. We will try, however inadequately, to give some impression of the result.

"Samuel Lover was born in Dublin on the 24th of February, 1797." That is the best sentence in the book. It gives a relevant fact without superfluous verbiage; and we doubt whether a Boswell or a Johnson could have materially improved the statement. The first two chapters tell us that Lover was a delicate and over-sensitive boy; and was therefore sent to live in a farmhouse for a year or two at the age of twelve. Here he entirely regained his strength, and was ever afterwards a healthy man. In these chapters Mr. Bernard has the advantage of a fact or two in Mr. Lover's reminiscences, which are not entirely swamped, though they are pretty deeply imbedded, in some remarks about Irish society at the time of the Union, about "Fighting Fitzgerald" and "Tiger Roche," and such worthies, which are apparently introduced to remind us that Mr. Lover was either not born at the time described, or was too young to be interested in such scenes. Then, however, we come to the most important three years in Lover's life. He resolved to leave his father's office and to learn painting. Unluckily, all that Mr. Bernard can tell us about his hero's proceedings is that he does not know precisely when Mr. Lover took this resolution—one person giving his age as sixteen, and another as twenty-three—nor how he lived, nor where. We do not even understand whether Lover left his father's house, or only his office. The safe conclusion at which Mr. Bernard arrives is, that somehow or other Lover got enough to eat, or, to speak in Mr. Bernard's beautiful language, to obtain "that most agreeable illustration of the doctrine of continuity—an unbroken succession of dinners." The space which would have been occupied with young Lover's adventures is therefore occupied by a long rhetorical description of the astonishment which the proceeding must have caused to the elder Lover, and by a discussion upon Irish art in general. Lover, at any rate, became by degrees a popular miniature-painter in Dublin, and was introduced to good society. Moreover he sang a song of his own composition at the dinner given to Moore in 1818. He was encouraged to the performance, it seems, by champagne, and we suspect that the same influence must have stimulated the applause bestowed upon a set of boyish verses beginning

T'other day Jove exclaimed with a nod most profound,

and continuing in an easily imaginable strain. Lover continued to live in Dublin till 1833. He married in 1827; and he became popular as a writer of small songs and stories. Mr. Bernard does not seem to know any particular facts about this part of his career; but he fills a good many pages by remarks upon the Irish temperament, by a survey of Irish songs in general, and some quotations from Mr. Lover's performances in that line. At one period, indeed, Mr. Lover began to keep a book in which he entered the smart sayings which circulated in Dublin society. Some are old—as, for example, the familiar story about Wolfe's praise of Gray's *Elegy* on the night before his great victory; and we cannot say that any are very good. Moreover Lover was a member of a grotesque convivial club, founded by Lever, the fun and facetiousness of which are long since utterly dead. In 1833 the miniature of Paganini, which he had painted, had a great success at the Royal Academy, and this seems to have determined Lover to migrate to London.

Here, as he comes within reach of Mr. Bernard's personal knowledge, we may expect the record to be rather fuller; but, on the whole, we have rather less of his personal history than before. Two chapters are eked out by a survey of Irish fiction, making us feel a guilty sense of ignorance in regard to that unparalleled blaze of genius, wit, humour, and pathos which illuminated the pages of Miss Edgeworth, Banim, Carleton, Griffin, Lady Morgan, Matutin, and others, but throwing very little light upon the author of *Handy Andy*. We gain perhaps a fresh idea of what Mr. Bernard calls "the calefactive depths of Celtism"; but we cannot at present communicate these new lights to our readers. We are next told that Mr. Lover was very popular in society, and to illustrate the excellence of his conversation we are regaled with two specimens of his "ready pleasantries," not, we are happy to say, the best, but those which recur to Mr. Bernard. A lady told him that she admired the Irish so much that she thought she was meant for an Irishwoman. "Cross the Channel, madam," he replied, "and millions will say you were meant for an Irishman." Another lady, being complimented on the passion which she had thrown into a song, said that she was as cold as "that marble"—pointing to a mantelpiece on a summer day—"and that's cold enough, I suppose." "Not always," replied this brilliant wit, "the fire has got to be lighted." A few stories are thrown in of Douglas Jerrold's witticisms, of which we can only say that, like most of Jerrold's recorded witticisms, they show that an alternation of puns and sheer rudeness is often taken for genuine humour. Jerrold, for example, found a man reading a stupid poem at a club, and dragged him up to its author, exclaiming, "Mr. So and So, allow me the pleasure of introducing you to your public." It would have been just as witty to say, "Mr. So and So, you are a fool," though the rudeness was intensified by knocking two people's heads together. After a good deal about songs in general—"songs," we are informed, "have their place in human

* *The Life of Samuel Lover.* By Bayle Bernard. London: Henry S King & Co. 1874.

history"—and a brief notice of Mr. Lover's pictures and publications, we come to the part of the history for which Mr. Bernard has proclaimed his special qualifications. Mr. Lover's eyes became weak, and he resolved to increase his income by giving an "entertainment." Like other men of greater reputation, he went to America to perform, and, as Mr. Bernard has also been in that rarely visited country, there is a good excuse for accounts of its less familiar phenomena. We are told, for example, that Americans are hospitable, though externally cold, and that they have a characteristic humour, this statement being illustrated by some of the usual facetiae. At last Mr. Lover gets to the Falls of Niagara. We are then duly told that so much has been said of these falls that Mr. Bernard can scarcely expect to be more successful in describing them; language, in fact, is inadequate for the purpose; they are therefore described once more. We are reminded that "we live in an age of science," and have therefore discovered that ninety million tons of water descend the falls every hour; and we are further informed that M. Blondin crossed them on a rope. At last Mr. Lover returns to England, and the last twenty years of his life, in regard to which one would think that the materials must have been more abundant, are summarily despatched in a short chapter—though even this chapter includes a long discussion as to the true definition and characteristics of the Irish lyric.

A second volume is filled with some sweepings from Mr. Lover's drawers, of which we shall only say that they may possibly be interesting to people who hold that Mr. Lover was a great writer, and that therefore every scrap from his pen is worth reading. One other remark must be added. The book itself, considered as a literary performance, is plainly one of those which ought never to have been written. The style is pompous, and sometimes ungrammatical, and the substance is an incoherent mass of what may pass for tolerable criticism. However, Mr. Bernard has a perfect right to publish a flimsy volume if he pleases. We merely wish to protest against making poor Mr. Lover the excuse for such a performance. To all appearance, he was a good, amiable, and hard-working man, who was not, it is true, a great literary light, but who certainly deserves no blame for not excelling his fellow-creatures more decidedly. But when the few recorded facts of his history are made the nucleus for such a performance, it is impossible that a certain amount of undeserved ridicule should not be reflected on his memory. We have no reason to think that he was personally vain, or would have sanctioned such a use of his name. As a matter of literary morality, his presumable intentions should have been respected; and as he left no materials for a biography, a flatulent production of this kind should not have been tacked on to his name. All that could be said about him might have been easily said in an article not longer than this review; and if such a notice had been prefixed to any of his works which may still be read, ample justice would have been done to the subject. Biographers have long been a nuisance, and the more flagrant cases of unnecessary biography should be noticed with the blame they deserve.

SEEBOHM'S PROTESTANT REVOLUTION.*

THIS is another volume of the same series to which Mr. Cox's book on the Crusades belongs. It starts with the apparent advantage that its author is known to have given special attention to one part at least of the subject which he has taken in hand. Mr. Seebohm had studied the Oxford Reformers, though few could see any reason why he called them the Oxford Reformers. The name gave everybody quite a different idea of the subject of the book from what it really proved to be. This fancy for giving queer names seems still to follow Mr. Seebohm. We get the Oxford Reformers again, though Mr. Seebohm does once or twice show some little doubt whether they ought to be called Oxford Reformers. And we get other names which, as they are used, are even less to the purpose. No one would quarrel with any one who, once in a book, in a rhetorical passage, spoke of the Papacy as "an ecclesiastical empire," and the act of the nations which threw off its yoke as a "revolt." The phrases suggest a real and important analogy. The later spiritual dominion of Rome has much in common with the earlier temporal dominion of Rome, and the likeness between the two is well expressed by the words "ecclesiastical empire." But the phrase is essentially a metaphor; it is essentially rhetorical; and no kind of phrase is less suited to be used as a technical formula. Yet this is the way in which Mr. Seebohm uses it. In page after page we hear of "the ecclesiastical empire" and "the revolt against the ecclesiastical empire," as set technical phrases, just as one speaks of "the Thirty Years' War" or "the French Revolution." We can fancy the result in an examination, if one fell in with a number of candidates who had been reading Mr. Seebohm. Even the title of the book is an example of the same kind of thing. Why "the Era of the Protestant Revolution"? No one would quarrel with the phrase "Protestant Revolution," any more than with the phrase "ecclesiastical empire," as a rhetorical and metaphorical phrase used once or twice in the course of a book. But it does not sound well for a title. Why not simply "the Era" or "Period," or whatever word is best liked, of "the Reformation." We have often had our laugh when people speak of "the Reformation" in England as if it were a thing which happened in a definite year, as if the

changes which were the final result of thirty years of change backwards and forwards were all made by a single Act of Parliament. But the Era or Period of the Reformation is a phrase which is perfectly intelligible, and which can mislead nobody. It perfectly well describes a period of which the reformation of religion was the main business and the main result. It has become so completely a technical phrase as to be quite colourless and to commit one to nothing. We fancy that a reasonable Roman Catholic would use it without any scruple. But "Protestant Revolution" has a twang about it; it has a big sound, such as might easily win a cheer in a speech; it is not nearly so well suited for a technical phrase. Mr. Seebohm may perhaps say that by "Protestant Revolution" he means something more than the mere reformation of religion, that he wishes to mark the spirit of the age of which the religious reformation was only the greatest sign. But the Era or Period of the Reformation would be understood by everybody to mean a good deal more than purely religious changes; and to our mind the received and well-understood name does its work better than the new and somewhat startling phrase of the Protestant Revolution. One does not at first sight know exactly what is meant; some minds might perhaps be tempted to think that by the Protestant Revolution was meant the Revolution of 1688. But this way of speaking is characteristic of Mr. Seebohm throughout. He is fond of putting everything in what is meant to be a neat and precise, a new and a rather startling way; but as with many attempts at extreme system and precision, the result is often by no means really so clear as ways of speaking which do not in the same way suggest effort. We get tired of Mr. Seebohm's constant divisions and analyses and short pointed sentences. A simpler way of writing would do the work a great deal better. Mr. Seebohm's colleague, Mr. Cox, at least carries us along with him. Mr. Seebohm does not carry us along with him, because he is always stopping and pulling us up. All this makes the book somewhat unsatisfactory to read, and it is made still more so by Mr. Seebohm's attempts in the early part of it to go into a great many matters which were hardly needed for his subject, and which he does not thoroughly understand. We do not know what his line of study may have been besides those parts of history which bear upon "the Oxford Reformers"; but it is clear that he has not that kind of knowledge of mediæval history which was needed by one who undertook the first part of the book, the introductory part, containing the four chapters headed "The State of Christendom." Almost at the very beginning, when Mr. Seebohm gives a picture of the general state of things at the time that his supposed subject opens, we come across such a sentence as this. He speaks of the Saracen conquest of Spain, how the Mahometans still kept Granada, and then he adds:—

But whilst checked in the West, Mohammedan arms had recently been encroaching more and more upon Christendom from the East. Turkey and Hungary had fallen into their hands, and in 1453, i.e. in the lifetime of the fathers of the men of the new era, Constantinople had been taken by the Turks.

Now such a confused phrase as "Turkey" falling into the hands of Mahometan arms is almost worse than the talk to which we are used about Cæsar landing in England and the like. Then it cannot be said that all Hungary fell into the hands of the Turks, though the greater part certainly did; but that was not till after the Turkish conquest of Constantinople and the Castilian conquest of Granada, while anybody who read Mr. Seebohm's sentence would fancy that it happened before them. This however may be only a confused way of talking. But what are we to say to such a statement as this a few pages on?—

In addition to the parochial clergy, there were orders of monks. The two chief of them were the rival orders of Dominican and Augustinian monks; and in most towns there were one, two, or half-a-dozen monasteries and cloisters. So numerous were the monks that they swarmed everywhere, and had become, by the favour of the Popes, more important and powerful in many ways than the parochial clergy.

Now is it possible that there can be any man who thinks himself fit to write about the ecclesiastical history of the middle ages who really thinks that the Dominicans and Augustinians were the two chief orders of monks? A very strict censor might quarrel with calling either of these orders monks at all; but, without going so deep as that, does Mr. Seebohm mean Austin Friars or Austin Canons? Has he never heard of the Benedictines, the Cistercians, or, to get amongst friars, the Franciscans? It is possibly because Savonarola was a Dominican and Luther an Augustinian that the historian of the Protestant Revolution thought that those two orders must be the two chief orders. Then, what is meant by monasteries and cloisters? Is he thinking of the use of the German word *Kloster*? but in that case "*Kloster*" simply means the same thing as monastery. And what is meant directly after by saying that the clergy "alone baptized, they alone married people (though they unmarried themselves), they alone could grant a divorce"? Does not Mr. Seebohm know that, setting aside the possible power of the Pope to do anything, there was, under the system of which he speaks, no power anywhere of granting a divorce, in the usual sense of that word—that is, the dissolution of a marriage allowed to have been valid when contracted? Presently we read:—

There was yet another most numerous and most important class affected by feudalism—the peasantry. The peasants, under the feudal system, were more or less reduced to a condition of vassalage or serfdom.

Does Mr. Seebohm really think that vassalage and serfdom are the same thing, that a Duke of the Normans, for instance, was a serf of the King of the French? But this strange confusion runs through all Mr. Seebohm's book. He is always talking about feudalism and serfdom as if they had something directly to do

* *The Era of the Protestant Revolution.* By Frederic Seebohm. London: Longmans & Co. 1874.

with one another. Indirectly, no doubt they had a good deal to do with one another; that is, the state of things which we vaguely call feudalism undoubtedly tended to push down the free peasant into a serf. But serfdom and the feudal tenure of lands have really nothing to do with one another. Yet Mr. Seebohm throughout his book speaks as if they were the same thing. For instance, in p. 49, he says:—

Under the feudal law the feudal tenants might not leave their land.

And we see directly that by feudal tenants Mr. Seebohm means villains. Presently he adds:—

By the time of Henry VII. feudal servitude or villenage was at an end in England.

It most certainly was not at an end, though no doubt it ceased to be of any great importance or to affect any large class.

But we might really have expected that Mr. Seebohm would have had some notion of the nature of the Empire. All that he has to tell us is:—

The German, or, as it called itself, "the Holy Roman" Empire, was a power which belonged to the old order of things. Like the Pope of Rome, the Emperor considered himself as the head of Christendom. He called himself "Cæsar," and "King of Rome"; and, as successor to the Roman Empire, which the Germans had conquered, claimed not only a feudal chieftainship over nations of German origin, but also a sort of vague sovereignty over all lands. As the Pope of Rome was the spiritual head, so the Emperor considered himself the "temporal head of all Christian people."

Does Mr. Seebohm know of anybody earlier than the son of the first Buonaparte who was ever called King of Rome? And really the distinction between a King of the Romans and an Emperor is not so mysterious but that it may be understood by an effort. Directly after this, Mr. Seebohm tells us that "Switzerland had indeed severed herself from the German Empire." The time when this happened is not told us, but from another passage it is plain that Mr. Seebohm thinks that the Forest Cantons threw off their connexion with the Empire at the time of Morgarten. Here is Mr. Seebohm's history of Switzerland:—

As early as the fourteenth century the Swiss peasants in the Forest Cantons had rebelled and thrown off the yoke of their Austrian feudal lords, and when the latter joined in a common cause against them, the Swiss were victorious in the battle of Morgarten, 1315. The Swiss had formerly belonged to the German Empire, and had the Empire done justice between them and their lords they would have been glad enough to remain free peasants of the Empire; but as the Empire helped their lords instead of them, they threw off the yoke of the Empire. They were soon joined by other neighbouring cantons, and their flag, with its white cross on a red ground, became the flag of a new nation, the Swiss confederacy, with its motto "Each for all, and all for each"—a nation of free peasants, letting out their sons as soldiers to fight for pay, and, alas, not always on the side of freedom!

Mr. Seebohm may possibly, like Sir Walter Scott, fancy that every Duke of Austria must be Emperor, and that every Emperor must be Duke of Austria, and so feel a little puzzled at the sight of Emperors or Kings or Dukes of Austria who were by no means on the best terms. But it so happens that for a long time the Confederates were on the best of terms with the chief of the Empire of which they still were members. Not even the legend of Tell himself can be so far from the truth as Mr. Seebohm's saying—when, according to all the rules of language, he must be speaking of the Forest Cantons specially—that "the Empire helped their lords," and that they threw off the yoke of the Empire. Has not Mr. Seebohm read how one of the alleged causes which led the Confederates into the Burgundian war was obedience to the bidding of "unser Herr der Kaiser," even though that Emperor was the Austrian Frederick the Third? Mr. Seebohm too seems to think that the Confederacy was wholly made up of "free peasants." Fancy the feelings of a patrician of Bern or Zürich on finding himself set down as a member of such a class. All these however are at most popular confusions which do not directly bear on Mr. Seebohm's immediate subject, and which he might have avoided by sticking more closely to that immediate subject; but we are amazed, when we get within his special time, to find the worthy Netherlander Pope Hadrian the Sixth set down as a Spaniard.

We have used up nearly all our space in speaking of parts of Mr. Seebohm's book which do not bear on his immediate subject, but we think that we have said enough to show that he is hardly a trustworthy guide; that he has, to say the least, undertaken to treat a subject without having thoroughly mastered it. We have read through the later part as well as the earlier, and we have looked specially to the part which concerns England. What strikes us there is the extreme meagreness of the account which Mr. Seebohm gives of the English Reformation. We hardly reach the stage at which we can begin to talk of accuracy or inaccuracy, there is so very little matter of any kind; yet the space which Mr. Seebohm has given to a long extract from Mr. Froude describing the death of Sir Thomas More would have given room, if room was what was needed, for explaining a great deal which Mr. Seebohm has slurred over. Still, that we may not part on altogether bad terms with Mr. Seebohm, we will end with an extract which puts forth a great truth plainly enough. At the beginning of one of his last chapters he puts the warning, "We ought never to forget that the Roman Catholic Church of our own times is, in fact, a reformed Church, as well as Protestant Churches." One of the greatest sources of popular error is identifying the modern Roman Catholic system, as fixed and stiffened at the Council of Trent, with the system of the mediæval Church before the Reformation. Against this error the words of Mr. Seebohm may serve as a useful protest.

HIKAYAT-I-ABDULLAH.*

THERE is a certain class of Indian journalists who are often fretting because we cannot get a frank and decided exposition of native wishes and ideas. We might, they say, meet with some startling revelations. We should see a foreign rule painted in its true colours, with the light places all dark, and the shadows made a trifle darker; difficulties of administration might, however, vanish under the process, and financial problems would be triumphantly solved. It is admitted by these writers that our self-love might be wounded, and that we should find out that India is not to be governed by flowery minutes and laudatory Blue-books. But, at some loss of national vanity, we should know how we had failed in spite of excellent intentions, why we manufactured sandals that always pinched the wearers, how completely we misunderstood the Oriental temperament, how wrong we had been in prematurely forcing on the natives our insular maxims and our rigid rules. In short, we might be lucky enough to secure a genuine political treatise which should somehow combine the minute knowledge of Abul Fazl with the condensed thought and the pregnant maxims of Tacitus. These hopes will certainly not be realized by the publication of the memoir before us. Yet it is a novel, amusing, and an interesting book. The author was a Mahomedan, born at Malacca in 1797. His father came from the Deccan, or Southern India, and his grandfather was a pure Arab of Yemen. His mother was a Malay. Besides the Malay language, which he spoke from his childhood, he became a proficient in Urdu or Hindustani, in Tamil, one of the Dravidian languages, and in Arabic. He also appears to have acquired some knowledge of English. In 1843, being then forty-six years of age, he wrote his autobiography, and he died about twelve or fourteen years afterwards, at the age of fifty-eight or sixty. The work has been given to the world with a copious commentary on the sayings and doings of the author, by Mr. J. T. Thomson, who had known Abdullah in the Straits Settlements. Of the worth of his notes and explanations we shall presently speak. As regards Abdullah himself, we must at once state our belief that his disclosures will not make the task of governing our Oriental dependency one whit easier than it has been. He has not conveyed to experienced administrators any clue which they had not obtained previously, nor has he presented them with striking and original suggestions as to the proper mode of taxing aliens, or of using a giant's strength with equity and moderation. But his memoir abounds with genuine native proverbs and apt local illustrations. Several of his portraits of persons, obscure or eminent, are admirable. In spite of some exaggerations, which are too obvious to deceive, an air of earnestness and truthfulness pervades the whole memoir. And in his remarks on new discoveries, scientific appliances, and European skill and resources, there is a naïveté, a simplicity, and a candour which at times remind us of Herodotus. He appears to have been both a kind father and a good husband, and he shows a toleration on religious matters which, for one nourished in an atmosphere of bigotry and fanaticism, is as praiseworthy as it is rare.

The youth of Abdullah was spent pretty much like that of young Mussulmans in general. He was under the dominion of a father who certainly never forgot one of Solomon's excellent maxims, and of a preceptor who vied with or outdid Orbillus and Squeers. But it was a proud day for young Abdullah when he drew out correctly, and without supervision, a bond for a sum of 300 dollars due from his father to a Chinese merchant. In Eastern countries, we should explain, practice in forms in use in legal and mercantile business is part of the scholastic course. To draw out a quittance, a lease, a mortgage, a petition asking for employment, a letter of thanks or congratulation, is in indigenous institutions as much a part of the regular work as are Greek Iambics and Latin hexameters at Eton or Harrow. From this time Abdullah's destiny was fixed. He taught languages, and he drafted letters and papers. He was witness to the occupation of Malacca by the English, to the subsequent entry of the Dutch, and to their abandonment of the settlement at the close of the war. His capacity for business brought him in contact with councillors and governors, captains of ships, preachers of religion, active police magistrates, and hectoring town majors. Some of his portraits, if not absolute photographs, are quite equal to passages in *Haji Baba*, and are better than the recent Diary of the Shah. Colonel Farquhar, the Governor of Malacca, is described as a man of good parts, and of an open hand, who was accessible to every one, and who made no difference between rich and poor. He appears to have been one of those administrators who carried out literally Sir John Malcolm's maxim of "opening to suitors the four doors of the house." Sir Stamford Raffles is depicted in the same light. He was courteous, thoughtful, a naturalist, well versed in the Malay language, and very inquisitive about native customs and habits. His physique is described with a minuteness which would be offensive were it not for the good intentions and the evident sincerity of the writer:—"His brow was broad; the sign of large-heartedness. His head betokened his good understanding; his hair, being fair, betokened courage; his ears, being large, betokened quick hearing; his eyebrows were thick, and his left eye squinted a little"; and so on for half a dozen more lines. Lord Minto, who was Governor-General of India, and visited Malacca when Abdullah was about fifteen, was at first sight disappointing. The author had looked for a man of high stature, lordly bearing, and gorgeous dress. Instead of this he saw a man step ashore,

* Translations from the *Hikayit Abdulla (Bin Abdulkadar) Münshi*. With Comments by J. T. Thomson, F.R.G.S., Author of "Some Glimpses into Life in the Far East," &c. &c. London: Henry S. King & Co. 1874.

under the roar of cannon, who was "middle-aged, thin in body, of soft manners, and of sweet countenance"; but so slow were his motions, that "I felt he could not carry twenty cutties, or thirty pounds." However, the Governor-General seems to have won many hearts by his manners and address, though he wore only "a black coat, trousers the same, nor was there anything peculiar." Of the leading men, with the exception of Sir Stamford Raffles, none dared "to grasp his hand;" "they took off their hats and bent their bodies."

But every one was not kind and courteous like these mighty potentates. And the peculiarities of a certain Mr. B., a colonel or commandant of Sepoys, supply the materials for a very different picture. This person was "of a very mischievous and wicked disposition." He made his dog catch vagrants. He set little boys to fight for coppers until they got swollen faces and bloody noses; and wicked lads, who ran away from school, attracted by these coppers, collected there to spar, to the great terror of respectable people. When tired of miniature prize-fights, he induced all Malacca to begin cock-fighting; and then he let out ducks into the sea, chased them with dogs, or fired at them with ball cartridge. As a climax of iniquity he appears to have anticipated Hurlingham, for "he bought wild pigeons, and when he was standing ready with his gun, he ordered his men to let them loose one by one for him to fire at. Thus some were struck and fell dead, others flew away." Also he shot apes, which, by the way, he would have done at his life's peril had there been a colony of Hindoos at Malacca. He squandered money amongst minions, and was "a scamp of a gentleman." We regret to say that idle subalterns at a loose end, in isolated cantonments, may have done this kind of thing. Dr. Milne and Dr. Morrison, of the London Mission Society, were great contrasts to this "scamp." The former "had the deportment of a gentleman." "Even in anger his countenance gleamed with mildness." The only fault of his colleague, Dr. Morrison, was that he wore the Chinese dress, doubtless to facilitate intercourse with men of that nation, and that "no one could have taken him for a white man." A Dutch Secretary named Maunboor (*Query Mynheer?*) had a pestilent activity and a mania for upsetting all that his predecessors had done. He sent some people to gaol for digging new wells or building new houses, fined others for leaving rubbish or dead rats and fowls in front of their houses, so that, when this active Secretary turned out, "the street would be chock-full of sweepers, making tumultuous noises." No wonder that "all races cursed him, and called him bad names." We much fear that the like has befallen active Chief Commissioners of Works, vestrymen possessed with a noble rage for sanitation, and heads of Local Boards. Then there was a wonderful doctor who "had a timber foot joined to his leg, but his knee was the same as ours," and he performed on Abdullah an operation which reads like tapping for the dropsy, and which resulted in a complete cure. A certain lieutenant, who was employed in making a chart of the coast, is described as "amiable and withal clever," and as "not in any way like the usual class of sailors, rough, wicked, and drunken." Another missionary "had not the tone of a clergyman," which the author explains by saying that he had not the polish of Dr. Milne and Dr. Morrison. He smiled perpetually, and would wear spectacles, but, "by reason of his bad memory," he never succeeded in mastering the Malay tongue. Though he could read the characters, when "you asked him the meaning, he did not know; and when he spoke, his meaning could not even be guessed." All these portraits show discrimination of character.

If the judgments of Abdullah on men show a lively and minute observation, his accounts of things are not less graphic. The mysteries of Hindu caste astonished and repelled him more than would be the case in a Mussulman born and educated in any part of the Indian Peninsula. A detachment of Sepoys touched at Malacca on its way to Java, and in a description marked by some exaggerations, but full of lively incidents which will be recognized as true by those acquainted with Hindu tenets, he tells us how some Hindoos would not eat in the presence of spectators, or would cast their food away if you went too near it: how they stood in the water up to their waists, bowing, and muttering, and counting on their fingers; how splendid was the appearance and admirable the discipline of some three hundred Mussulmans whom by the description we take to have been high-bred Irregular Cavalry from Upper India; how big bullocks never moved a muscle when huge cannon went off close to their ears; how the horses of the cavalry obeyed the sound of the trumpet and manœuvred of their own intelligence; and how, at the close of the parade, English officers amused themselves and others by leaping their horses over fences "seven cubits high." Unluckily, the novelty of these sights was followed by a great rise in the price of provisions. Three eggs were sold for two *peangs*, or one shilling. Fowls rose to a rupee a piece, and the "mud fish in the creeks, in all their filthiness," were finished. At this time Lord Minto inspected the gaol, and was so horrified at seeing the instruments of torture left behind by the Dutch that "he gloomed heavily, and, spitting," ordered them to be burnt. He also made such a change in penal discipline that gaol, instead of being "such a place as hell is," became one which some men liked or had no fear of, openly saying "This is no punishment." Abdullah, however, is careful to add that he has no sympathy with such foolish notions, as "incarceration is in itself a punishment, and the gaol a place of infamy."

Certain aborigines known as the Orang Laut appeared to the author in their true character as rank pirates, with their cutaneous diseases and filthy habits. They were expert divers, and had no fear of sharks, which fish were pirates like themselves; but, oddly enough,

they did not claim kindred with tigers, one of which animals had lately carried off the uncle of one of the party. We take it that these wild men, like the Jamaica negroes, had become so expert in the water that they could defy the shark in his own element. The laying of the foundation of the Singapore Institute is very well described, with the ceremony of burying gold and silver coin in the centre of the first stone. In endeavouring to state the causes of an eclipse according to Hindoo notions, the biographer has fallen into an error which the editor has failed to detect. Popular belief said that the moon was eaten by a snake, and the word *ruh*, says Abdullah, in the language of Hindostan means snake. Abdullah has here evidently got a confused notion of the demon Rahu, who, according to Hindu mythology, periodically endeavours to swallow the moon. But in trying to discredit this and other idle interpretations and to give the true cause of such a phenomenon, Abdullah found, he tells us, that his endeavours were like a "pot of fresh water poured into the sea; it also became salt, and my instruction had no result." There are several other pithy proverbs familiar to the Malays scattered over the memoir, which bear a family likeness to the sayings of Oriental writers of fables. Puffers are described as grasshoppers, who, in the place where there are no cultures, "are their own trumpeters, and call themselves vultures." Ill-nature is worse than a cutting instrument, for "knives and choppers may be blunt, but the mouths of mankind are very sharp." Again, by "a blue drop (i.e. a drop of indigo) spoils the milk in the pail," we are to understand the spread of contamination; and the old proverbs of the Ethiopian's skin and the leopard's spots appear thus in the Malay version, "If a crow were to bathe in attar of roses and to be fed on ambergris and musk, it would not make its feathers white, but black they would remain."

We should have been glad to award an equal measure of praise to the editor for his share in the work. But truth compels us to state that his views on politics are superficial, his reasoning disjointed, and his remedies silly. The translation is disfigured by slangy expressions at which Abdullah, who was something of a purist, would have been much shocked. The Greek proverb seems to us quite in point:—

πολλοὶ μαθηταὶ κρείττονες διδάσκαλῳ.

The relative position of the Oriental and the European intellect has in this book been inverted, and it only remains for some native Munshi or Pundit to compose a treatise to show us how incoherent thoughts and rambling annotations may be compatible with the letters F.R.G.S. There are plenty of tirades about our misgovernment of the East, and in one passage the East India Company is described as made up of Radicals and Democrats. Now the old Directors, with many political virtues, had some faults, but they never erred on the side of haste and demolition. They were steady Conservatives in administration, and, as all who have studied their history know, tender to a fault where existing customs and native prejudices were concerned. The following remarks on the members of the Indian Civil Service need no comment. For airy grace, elegant diction, and polished criticism, the passage might have been envied by the editor of the *Edinburgh Gazette*:—"They are narrow-minded, perverted, and jaundiced, superintending nose-grinders, termed members of the Civil Service." But what, indeed, can be expected of men "whose real capacity entitles them for the most part to perform routine duty," and who were surprised in the Mutiny "like the revellers of Babylon by Cyrus?"

The cures which Mr. Thomson suggests for these and other evils are as wonderful as his strictures. Ladies ought to marry "educated natives," and gentlemen should form "similar connexions"; and, "the bond of sympathy being thus practical, the superior mind of the white would enormously increase its functions." This is the way matters were excellently managed in New Zealand; and so forth. Then we are informed that Bass and Allsopp have a great deal to answer for in destroying the morale of the Indian army. Beer makes the system inert and obese, and predisposes to fever. It is also detrimental to sound habits and to self-respect. Mr. Thomson supports this powerful reasoning by an interesting anecdote of a European who always had a cool following him with a three-dozen chest of beer when he left his home. Unfortunately, the effect of this damaging piece of evidence is slightly marred by the admission that the gentleman was not a soldier at all. But Mr. Thomson is still quite ready to "vote that the beverage be abolished from the Indian army." In other respects the editor does not seem very highly qualified for his task. A little care and research would have cleared up some names or allusions in the biography which have been left obscure, though we readily admit that natives have a great talent for corrupting or disguising Anglo-Saxon phraseology. What Abdullah could have meant by the Hindoo year *Manmada* and the month *Pertasai*, to use his own style, "cannot be conceived, even in a dream." But Mr. Thomson might have known that a celebrated collection of fables is not the *Panjatambaran*, but the *Pancha Tantra*; and the Mahomedan version of the same, which has no doubt got into Malay, is *Kalila wa Dumno*, and not *Gallila dan Demina*. We should also like to have some other authority for the existence of "moose deer," which we thought peculiar to Canada and North America, in the Malay peninsula. Mr. Thomson further speaks of Sir Benjamin Malcolm as Recorder of the Straits Settlements. The gentleman intended is no doubt Sir B. Malin, afterwards one of the Puisne Judges of the old Supreme Court at Calcutta. But Mr. Thomson has never read, or, if he has, has managed to forget, the elegant inscription on this Judge's tomb

which was written by his friend and contemporary, Lord Macaulay. It has been published in Macaulay's miscellaneous writings, together with the epitaph on Metcalfe, and the inscription for Lord William Bentinck's statue. Still these blunders and the editor's disjointed style do not extinguish in us all sense of gratitude to him for giving us the perusal of an original and truthful autobiography which is more amusing than many tales of fiction.

GEIGER'S PEEP AT MEXICO.*

THAT part of the North American Continent to which Nature has been most kind was the first to be conquered by European adventurers three centuries and a half ago; and the sort of civilization which they founded seems likely there first to decay. In Mexico, as well as in Peru, the Spaniards arrived not in the character of colonists, but in that of invaders and supplanters, taking possession of wealthy and populous native realms. In Mexico, and likewise in Peru, the inherent vices of Spanish rule, both political and ecclesiastical, have resulted at times in a worse anarchy than has raged in other Spanish American States. Promises of amendment, as bondholders have proved to their cost, are frequent and emphatic in proportion to those financial needs which afford a fair measure of the civil disorganization. Perhaps the best that can as yet be safely asserted of the progress of actual improvement in those countries is the fact that railways have been constructed to their chief cities by Companies of foreign shareholders. This pledge of social order and prosperity, as many English men of business were not long since disposed to regard it, may be admired from the port of Vera Cruz to the capital of Mexico, along a line which does great credit to modern engineering skill. The city thus approached is a very grand and beautiful city, in spite of much that is squalid about it, like a robe of rich brocade with a train dragged in the mire. A traveller from Europe, entering the country on the Atlantic side, might, if so inclined, remark little to disturb his mood of complacent approval. But then he must not ask questions of any foreign residents in Mexico; and he must go no further from the capital than a jaunt to the palatial castle of Chapultepec, the shrine of Guadalupe Hidalgo, the shores of the adjacent lakes, or possibly even an ascent of Popocatepetl. That is what he might call a "Peep at Mexico"; but Mr. Geiger, though he was only five weeks in the country, took more than a peep at its front door and front parlour. He went in by its back door at Manzanillo, on the Pacific coast, and travelled through the neglected western provinces and the unsettled districts of the interior—unsettled in a different sense from uninhabited. Making his way to the capital by a tedious route through the States of Colima, Jalisco, Guanajuato, and Queretaro, he saw much and heard more that is unpleasant in the manners and institutions of this troublous raw Republic. He felt indeed, in his very bones, the intolerable condition of the roads, which he denounces by almost every epithet that expresses the extreme of hatred, as wretched, barbarous, cruel, horrible, murderous, diabolical, and fiendish. Under these circumstances, it must be some consolation to him to have formed a theory which refers all that is amiss to one malignant agency. It is the Roman Catholic priesthood that must here answer for all.

The journey of Mr. Geiger from the western to the eastern side of Mexico was mainly coincident in direction with that of a lady two years before, whose *South by West* experiences and observations lately composed an entertaining volume, prefaced with an introduction from her near relation, Canon Kingsley. She was in the country a longer time than Mr. Geiger, and in the spring and early summer, from March to the middle of June. The middle portion of her route, between the towns of Guadalajara and Queretaro, diverged from that which Mr. Geiger followed, and therefore did not lead her through the important mining district of Guanajuato. This place, and the large manufacturing town of Leon, a day's ride distant from it, afford the best pictures of thriving industry in the States of the Mexican Federation. The entire State of Guanajuato, with a population of 874,000, is commended as an exception to that which may perhaps be styled, by a phrase parallel with the familiar proverb of the parent nation, "cosas de Mejico." This part of Mr. Geiger's information is supplementary to that which we gained so recently from *South by West*, whereas much else of what he tells us has been anticipated by that lively narrative.

Guanajuato has been famous for its mineral riches since the time immediately following the Spanish conquest. Its present yearly exports of silver and gold amount in value to six million dollars. The mine called La Valenciana, formerly the most productive, has long been filled with water in its shaft and tunnels, extending several miles, and to a depth of 2,000 feet. Within the last two years a Company has begun to pump out the water and to raise blocks of quartz for the crushing and smelting process, an amalgam of mercury and sulphur being used to extract the silver. The machinery, except that of the pumps, which are worked by a small steam-engine from Manchester, is dependent on mules for its motive power. Only the most promising pieces of ore go into the stamping-mills; and the houses of the miners' village are built with stones that contain undoubted veins of silver, not worth the cost of its abstraction. Whenever the Mexican Government shall take off the five per cent. export duty on this metal, or if its value shall from any cause suddenly rise in the world, it is likely that these cottages will be

demolished and literally converted into money, or else into spoons. We forbear to repeat what Mr. Geiger was told of the success and prospects of particular mines which are often mentioned in our own Share Market. He says there are more than a hundred mines in Guanajuato; and the detailed account which is appended to *South by West* gives fifty-two as the number in actual working. Those of Zacatecas, of San Luis Potosi, and of several other districts, make up altogether, by the same account, an aggregate Mexican silver product, coined and uncoined, to the value of forty million dollars. The transport of the precious metal from the mining districts to the capital is undertaken by the Federal Government, which levies a tax upon it for the service. The roads are always infested by robbers or revolutionists, so the convoy of waggons or pack-mules is guarded by an escort of soldiers. Mr. Geiger here repeats an anecdote very characteristic of the "cosas de Mejico." It happened once upon a time "that the Government themselves were in such urgent need of funds that they went through the farce of an attack on the convoy, so as to secure the treasure. They, however," adds Mr. Geiger, "only considered it as a forced loan; for some time afterwards all the owners were fully reimbursed." A precedent or two might easily be quoted, from the European history of a remote age, for this humorous fiscal expedient. But it would not bear too frequent repetition.

The town or city of Guanajuato, founded in 1554, resembles some of those in old Spain in its architectural aspect. This is partly owing to its situation in the narrow ravines and on the steep slopes of three converging mountain glens, causing the houses to be crowded together as in the ancient walled towns of Europe, which were so often built at the confluence of streams breaking through the hills. Other Mexican towns are commonly placed on level and open ground, and laid out in straight streets of uniform width, with low, flat-roofed houses presenting only their large gateways and one row of barred windows to the street. Mr. Geiger's photographs of views in Colima, Sayula, and Guadalajara, among the numerous illustrations of that kind which adorn his volume, bear out his complaint of the monotonous appearance of those provincial towns. But one or two features which occur in almost every such town of Mexico would appear almost noble. These are the Cathedral and the Plaza, not to forget the Alameda or public garden. The last-named provision for the solace of townsfolk, who are seldom oppressed with excessive business, is delightful, as might be expected in a country producing the loveliest flowers, shrubs, and trees of a semi-tropical clime. In their culture and artistic arrangement the Mexicans show much taste and skill. The public garden is also furnished with a fountain in a marble basin. The Paseo, a road or avenue shaded by trees for a promenade, is another pleasing adjunct to the ordinary town. In the Plaza or great square, of which Mr. Geiger photographs all the four sides at Colima, as well as in the metropolitan city, arcades of an elegant style, Moorish or Italian, support the fronts of good two-storied houses with shops below. The cathedral church, where there is a bishop's see, is a magnificent building, with a dome and a pair of steepled turrets, perhaps further ornamented with mosaics or coloured tiles. Such is a Mexican town. The interior of a house there is a secluded retreat, with lofty rooms opening to an airy verandah which surrounds the square yard or garden entered by a gateway through the building in front. At Guanajuato, where ground is scant, many houses are four or five stories high. There are here 63,000 inhabitants; but Leon, renowned for its leather, metal, cotton, and woollen manufactures, has a population of 100,000; and Guadalajara contains 75,000. The last-named city, which is the capital of the great province of Jalisco, boasts eight or nine weekly and half-weekly newspapers, a superb cathedral painted externally blue and yellow, an amphitheatre for bull-fights, which are disallowed elsewhere in Mexico, an opera-house, a well-managed hospital, a founding hospital, an asylum for the aged poor, and a college for young ladies. These benevolent and educational institutions are praised by Mr. Geiger, as well as by the author of *South by West*. Yet the city where they are found, and the province of which it is the head, are esteemed the most lawless, lazy, priest-ridden, and bandit-ridden part of Mexico. In the most important local centres the foreign trade is chiefly in the hands of a few resident German merchants, but there are some French and English.

Brigandage and bad roads all over the country are the two great obstacles to the public welfare. In the better-governed province of Guanajuato, we are told, the administration has for many years been carried on by General Antillon, "who, unlike the majority of State officials, does not owe his position to guerilla or brigand exploits." The inference from this remark does not exactly fit Mr. Geiger's favourite theory that "every ghastly blot on modern Mexico is associated with the devastating influence of the clergy." By his own testimony, it is the "Liberal" party, in their heroic conflict with "Ultramontane machinations," who have frequently raised to the governorship of States men of "criminal antecedents" deserving "the treadmill." The priests and bishops, we dare say, have some of the faults of their order in Mexico as in other Roman Catholic countries. But it is difficult to see how they can desire to make the common highways unsafe for passengers and merchandize. It is more easy to understand why a "Liberal" captain of highwaymen, promoted to civil authority, should cast the blame of secular depredations on a priesthood so obnoxious to his political patrons. In comparing, however, these "cosas de Mejico" with the "cosas de España," or those of other European States, it is fair to observe that two-thirds of the whole population, which exceeds nine millions, are of pure Indian race. Two and a half millions are of mixed breed, and the creoles of

* *A Peep at Mexico*. Narrative of a Journey across the Republic from the Pacific to the Gulf in December 1873 and January 1874. By John Lewis Geiger, F.R.G.S. Trübner & Co.

pure Spanish blood are but half a million. The late President Juarez, "one of Mexico's noblest," was of the pure indigenous race. It is considered that the Mestizos, like the mulattoes in some West Indian islands, are the turbulent portion of Mexican society. Its composition altogether does not seem hopeful for national unity. And since the bond of Government administration is frail, while that of a common religion is relaxed by the discredit into which the Church has fallen through political partisanship, the Republic has no assured prospect of peace. But the tragic death of Maximilian, and the ignominious failure of Napoleon III., will deter the most enterprising of princes and statesmen from any future attempt to provide a ruling monarchy for this extremely independent country. Its more recent history may perhaps be described as a Mestizo edition of that of Spain, but without the Carlists, and with Intransigentes only of that primitive type who claim the stoppage of coaches on the highway. An occurrence of this nature is what the Mexicans understand by a "novedad," or simply an incident, just as the Southern Italians mean a stabbing murder when they speak of an "accidente." This Mexican "novedad" is something less than a novelty, though it may amount to stripping ladies all but naked upon the road after killing their husbands or other male companions who have ventured a defence. The English lady we have quoted, and her American lady friend, carried pistols to aid the rides with which the gentlemen of their party were armed.

Under these circumstances the traveller for pleasure who would enjoy "a Peep at Mexico," without being too much jolted and not improbably robbed, is advised to eschew the "South by West" route which takes him in, the back way, from the San Francisco steamboat. Let him just run up from Vera Cruz by the railway to the capital, ascending two grand natural terraces, from the "tierra caliente" to the "tierra templada," and from this to the "tierra fria." This is a road of 263 miles passing from the luxuriant groves of tropical vegetation below to that fair upland valley, 7,600 feet above the sea-level, which is favoured with the most agreeable and healthy climate upon earth. The scenery is described as far excelling, in its wild and mighty loveliness, that of central and western Mexico. For it includes the glorious snow-clad cone of Orizaba; the mountain passes of Chiquihuite, the Infierillo, and Maltrata, with amazing views of forest, rock, and river; and the rapid ascent of those "cumbres," or huge land-steps, which rise 2,000 feet and 4,000 feet within a very few miles of zigzag climbing. It is certainly worth while to go up to the city of Mexico, which has great beauties of situation and of structure, besides its romantic associations with Cortez and Montezuma, and the popular historical narrative of its conquest. Mr. Geiger's photographs of the city and its neighbourhood are acceptable, but his description is poor. Indeed, both in style and matter, and in spirit also, his book is very inferior to that of the young lady whom Mr. Kingsley introduced to the world. But he confirms the truth of her account.

THOMAS'S DIOCESE OF ST. ASAPH.*

THE see of St. Asaph is indebted to Mr. Thomas for a History the like of which in scope and magnitude we cannot call to mind in the case of any other English diocese. This work, which after several years of unremitted labour he has at length brought to a close, is no mere annotated Clergy List, or illustrated record of a Diocesan Church Building Society, but an able and thorough synopsis of the history of the diocese of St. Asaph, ecclesiastical and civil, as well as ecclesiological and literary, from the time of its foundation by Kentigern, when its cathedral was a frail framework of wood and wattle of the type of Melverley, to the present time, when the material fabric is at least seemly and substantial, and when, after an interval beginning with the translation of Bishop Wynne, the diocese possesses once more a Welsh-speaking bishop. Gifted with a spirit of keen antiquarian research, a perfect knowledge of his native tongue, and an industry guided by tact and ability, Mr. Thomas strikes us as having produced a model for other diocesan historians, at the same time that he has furnished a body of excellent matter for the antiquary, the topographer, and the general reader.

It is beside our purpose to devote more than a glance, in passing, to Mr. Thomas's clear and comprehensive sketch of the history of the see. He puts before his readers each successive landmark of the annals of the diocese distinctly yet succinctly, not stinting statistics when he has to deal with the Taxatio of Pope Nicholas in 1288-1291, as an index to the value of chapter, parochial, and monastic incomes at that day, or when he has to handle, by way of comparison, the Valor Ecclesiasticus of the 26 Henry VIII., as the standard of church revenues and contributions to the State some two hundred and fifty years later. Mr. Thomas knows how to vary such details by occasional episodes of a lively character, as, for instance, where he narrates the controversy between Bishop Anian II. and Giraldu Cambrensis, the doughty Archdeacon of Brecon, about the jurisdiction of Kerry (pp. 37-41); the raids and retaliations of Owen Glyndwr, whose method of persuading Bishop Trevor to side with him was by burning his cathedral (p. 67); the desecration of St. Asaph by the Puritans; and the well-meant endeavours of Bishop Lloyd to persuade the Quakers. He also gives biographical notices of those great agents of spiritual enlightenment in Wales, the translators of the Bible and Prayer-Book into Welsh, William Salesbury, Bishop Richard

Davies, Dr. William Morgan, and others, as well as of the holders of the see who have attained a name as literary divines, from Reginald Pecock down to Isaac Barrow and Beveridge. Especially candid, too, is his examination of the rise, progress, and prospects in St. Asaph of Dissent and Methodism, with his honest estimate of the work of Charles of Bala, and his acute perception of the strength and weakness of the system, which has since been cumbered and embarrassed by the admixture of politics and finance.

Those who take up this volume as a handbook to the ecclesiology of the diocese may perhaps think that the first dozen chapters present details to be skipped, or at least cursorily glanced over; and yet these chapters contain the key to a great deal of the obscure parts of the parochial history which follows. It is essential, for instance, to understand the action of the Popes in support of the heads of monastic houses claiming a right to presentations to benefices, as against the Crown and the bishop of the diocese, before we can trace the anomalies of patronage in particular cases; to realize the twofold aspect, civil and military, of such parishes as Denbigh, in the early times, before we can account for its parish church standing a mile without the walls, whilst St. Hilary's, the large church on its height, is the ancient garrison chapel; and, again, the relation of divers smaller cures to their *collegium*, once nearly coextensive with the mother parish. All these things are explained in the chapters to which we have referred; and it may be added that the historian does equal justice to the material and spiritual aspects of the subject. Thus, when in pp. 68-9 he records the material church-building spirit which marked in St. Asaph the cessation of the Wars of the Roses and the establishment of the Tudors on the throne—a spirit evinced by the rebuilding of the cathedral, as well as by the churches of the Stanley series at Mold, Holywell, Northop, Gresford, Llangollen, and elsewhere—he is led at once by a natural transition to consider the spiritual restoration of the primitive Catholic faith, just then waxing into assured form and consistency.

The original cathedral, probably the "Paupercula sedes Llanelvensis" seen by Giraldu Cambrensis, and that destroyed by fire by the soldiers of Henry III. in A.D. 1245, was, as we have said, of the type presented by the existing church of Melverley, and of the same character as the original church at Meifod, called Eglwys Gwyddfarch after the hermit supposed to have built it for his oratory. A visit to Melverley, the "sea-like place," as the name in Welsh imports, on account of its frequent flooding by the Severn and the Vyrnwy, which here approach their confluence, would show a structure of timber framework bound together longitudinally and compacted internally by two rude beams dividing the body of the church into chancel and nave and ante-chapel. The interspaces of the walls are mostly filled in with "wattle and dab," and the whole is as quaint and antique as Trelystan, over the border in Salop, was in time past. The cathedral was again destroyed by fire in A.D. 1278, applied to it by a sallying party from Rhuddlan, and again in 1402, through the vengeance of Owen Glyndwr. The present edifice represents in the main Bishop Redman's restoration of 1482; and the renovation of it under the direction of Sir G. G. Scott, now receiving its finishing touches, will entitle it to hold up its head amongst the cathedrals of Wales.

If we pass by the cathedral, and the kindred churches of the Stanley series, two distinct types seem to mark, each in its special district, a large portion of the diocese of St. Asaph. The visitor cannot fail to be struck, if, beginning with the Welsh, or "parish" church of St. Asaph or Llanelwy, he inspects the ecclesiastical architecture of the Vale of Clwyd, with the predominating characteristic of two equal and parallel arches, and commonly, as at Caerwys, Rhuddlan, Abergelle, and Cilcein, with a tower at the western end of the north aisle. These aisles are mostly separated by pillars, clustered as at Llanelwy, octagonal as at Whitechurch or Llanfarchell, the extramural parish church of Denbigh, or in one or two cases like Caerwys and Llanarmon yn Iâl, simply of oak, more or less wrought. Llanasa, Llansilio, Llanrhaidy, Chirk, and Hope preserve the same common feature amidst many notes of distinction, and it has been laudably respected in the restorations which are the rule, almost without exception, of the diocese during the present century. The other feature is peculiar to Montgomeryshire and its border, and consists of a wooden belfry, not infrequently of two stories, at the west-end, either surmounting a stone tower or run up, as was the case at Llandysill till 1866, from the ground within, touching the western gable wall, piercing the roof, and then expanding into an open gallery running round and a double roof above. A woodcut of this is given in p. 328. The church at Kerry still retains its massive western tower with the double belfry as Giraldu saw it in 1176, and with a peal of bells representing those which helped to settle the dispute which he describes, "when, 'simul omnes trino intervallo,' they tolled out the solemn and awful clang" (p. 322). The old church at Newtown, and that at Llanfair, have the same distinguishing feature, to which we may add the belfry at Manafan, and that which till the beginning of the century existed at Berriew. The church of Llansantffraid yn Mechain retains still its spire-topped wooden steeple, supported by a massive timber framework of the true Montgomeryshire type. In this district, too, we note that the spirit of restoration has respected the characteristic feature which makes an old Montgomeryshire church unlike aught of more modern construction. The parts of the diocese where, save in traditions, the church is least rich in ancient or restored edifices, are the rural deaneries of Llanrwst and Penllyn

* *A History of the Diocese of St. Asaph, General, Cathedral, and Parochial. With Illustrations.* By the Rev. D. R. Thomas, M.A., Rector of St. Mary's, Cefn. London: Parker & Co. 1874.

and Edeirnion. It is true that in the former we have the parish church of Llanrwst with its beautifully carved rood-loft and screen and graceful bands of vine pattern, as well as its Gwydir chapel, memorable amongst other things for its Jacobean woodwork. But for the most part these churches on the mountain border depend for interest on the traces of St. Winifred, as at Gwytherin, or of the warrior saint Derfel Gadarn, as at Llanderfel, although this last has of late years been well restored. Apropos of Llanderfel, Mr. Thomas has thrown curious light upon St. Derfel's horse, a wooden image in a recumbent position, which had a solemn place in the church until at least 1730. It was really the dismembered trunk of the effigy of a red stag, an offering to the patron saint, who, like Cynfran, Sior, and others, was traditionally associated with pasture and the chase as well as the pastoral staff. This red stag Mr. Thomas suspects to be the counterpart of the white stag which legend connects with the foundation of Llangar church, as having set the boundaries of the parish (p. 711), as also perhaps of the "white hind" associated with Selattyn, and of Ethelred's milk white doe, still seen in a fresco on the walls of St. John's, Chester. While mentioning the Jacobean woodwork in the Gwydir chapel at Llanrwst, we may add that at Denbigh, Gwyddelwern, Llanfair, and elsewhere, there are beautiful specimens of this kind of church-fitting. At Rhug, a chapel attached to Corwen, there is also a very curious display of Jacobean carving and painting, bearing date 1637. Mr. Thomas omits to mention, in reference to this, a singular candelabrum of woodwork, apparently of the same date, and embellished in a like fashion with the rest of the woodwork.

It is impossible within our limits to notice a tithe of the points of interest associated with the churches of St. Asaph. One of Mr. Thomas's merits consists in the evenness of treatment which does as much justice to the remoter and less memorable parishes as to the noble churches of Whitechurch, Mold, Gresford, Wrexham, and other similar glories of North Wales. Of the first of these, the sculptured stone corbels, and the bosses ending the rafters, as well as the grotesque figures of animals in the grooved wall-plates, are perhaps the most striking feature. Mold, with its nave divided from the aisles by seven arches supported on clustered columns with sculptured capitals of animal and floral life, its clerestory windows, banded beneath by stonework quatrefoils and panelling, and its shield-bearing angels between the springs of every arch, is justly deemed one of the most perfect churches in the Principality; while Gresford, with its beautiful fifteenth-century additions (the upper part of the tower, the rood-loft, screen, perpendicular roof, chantries, and painted glass windows) to the fabric of the thirteenth century, is a sight not to be forgotten by those who have once gazed on it, any more than Wrexham, with its elaborate and beautiful tower of the same period. Mr. Thomas says of Gresford:—"The tower is set off with pinnacles and battlements, and upon the latter, as well as on the face of the buttresses at the angles, stand carved figures of angels, warriors, and kings. Traceried bands, quaint gurgoyles, and hollow cornices adorn its four sides, and these last, carried round the entire church, represent, as at Mold and elsewhere, a chase of cats, mice, dogs, and grotesque creatures." It is worthy to rank with Wrexham, which is perhaps seen to more effect from its situation, and which justifies to the full, by the numerous figures adorning its canopied shrines, the quaint description of old Churchward:—

Trim pictures fayre in stone on outside are
Made all like waxe, as stone were nothing deare.

With such types before them it is but meet that the magnates of the diocese should emulate each other in grand and worthy restorations; and in fairness it may be said that the new churches at Bodelwyddan, Cefn, Trefnant, Llandulas, &c., show a spirit not unworthy of the old church-builders in the diocese.

A great help to Mr. Thomas in writing the history of the diocese must have been his knowledge of the Welsh language, which enables him to settle debated questions, and to throw curious light upon dubious localities. In such names as Cwm, Nantglyn, Bettws, Kerry, and Rhuddlan, it is some natural feature which has given the church and parish its name. Cnerwys and Bodfari are names traceable to Roman antecedents. Efenecthyd, in the Vale of Clwyd, may be identified with the Gytheriac nunnery mentioned in an old document, as much through the signification of its name as through its ancient knocker on the door, illustrative of the parable of the Ten Virgins. Disserth, Ruthin, and Denbigh derive their names from their military aspect, being respectively the steep fort, the red fort, and the hill fort. The former name of Denbigh is said to have been Caledfryn, or "the rocky hill." Ruthin is an instance of a military capella converted into a parochial church, and eventually swallowing up the tithes of the mother church Llanrhyd. Very interesting, too, is the light thrown upon the various Cambro-British saints, and such early missionaries as St. Germanus, their churches, crosses, and, more than all, their wells. Touching these last alone an article might be written, full of interest. But the readers of the *History of St. Asaph* will find it pleasant work to make out all these bypaths of ecclesiology for themselves, and we can promise them that Mr. Thomas is a no less lively than laborious guide. Nowhere does he neglect a quaint legend or an apt anecdote. Anent Whittington Church he chronicles Robert Montgomery's description of himself, whilst a curate there, as "an oak in a flowerpot"; and, as a commentary on the legend of the old vicarage house at Bettws Abergele—

Vicar Jones and Vicar Sampson
Joined their pence to build this mansion—

he cites, with mingled accuracy and humour, an old terrier of 1729-30, which shows the mansion to have been 13 yards long by 4½ broad, with a thatched roof and the living rooms floored with lime. The work has been carried through the press with considerable pains and care, and deserves a place in the libraries of all who are curious in the history of the Church in Wales.

TRANSATLANTIC PEDIGREES.*

MANY indications appear of the interest taken by Americans in genealogy and private history. We open at hazard the *Book of the Hudson*, published a few years ago, and find a view of the residence of Colonel Peter Schuyler, of the Flats, the first Mayor of Albany, who as Indian Commissioner took four sachems of the Mohawks to London, and presented them at the Court of Queen Anne. "After his death, his son Philip, the well-beloved of the Mohawks, who married his sweet cousin Katrina, the 'Aunt Schuyler' immortalized by Mrs. Grant of Laggard, resided there." It appears that Mrs. Grant wrote a pleasant book called *Albany Society a Hundred Years Ago*, which, with genuine American exaggeration, is said to have "immortalized" an ornament of that society who is mentioned there. We turn two pages and find a view of the "Van Rensselaer Manor House," and an explanation of the title of "patroon" and the manorial privileges which belonged to the owner of that estate. It appears that Killian van Rensselaer, pearl merchant of Amsterdam, became, under charter of 1629, proprietor, jointly with three other persons, of a tract of land upon the Hudson containing over 700,000 acres, and in him as "patroon" were vested civil and criminal jurisdiction and "feudal honours." In the Manor House, as it is still called, is a part of an illuminated window which for 190 years occupied a place in the old Dutch church. "It bears the arms of the Van Rensselaer family, which were placed in the church by the son of Killian." A few pages further on we are told that the right bank of the Hudson near Kattskill "is distinguished for old and elegant country seats, most of them owned and occupied by the descendants of wealthy proprietors who flourished in the last century, and were connected by blood and marriage with Robert Livingston, a Scotch gentleman, of the family of the Earls of Linlithgow, who came to America in 1672, and married a member of the Schuyler family, the widow of a Van Rensselaer."

We may be sure that the Hudson is not the only American river on which "manor houses" still exist, and the memory of, or belief in, pedigrees is cherished. It need not therefore surprise us that a bulky and costly volume has been published purporting to contain the names of the emigrant ancestors of many thousands of American families. The book is dedicated to the Genealogical and Historical Societies of America, to whom the lists of names, of which it principally consists, will probably be more interesting than they can be to us. It is indeed possible that the inquiries in which these Societies delight may be pushed too far. A pedigree should not always be accurately investigated, unless the explorers are prepared to accept unpleasant truths. The book before us contains "lists of the living and dead in Virginia" in 1623-4, and it is open to present citizens of that State to make such selection of ancestors from these lists as may appear feasible. We may remark, however, that a recent book on *The English Colonization of America during the Seventeenth Century* contains statements as to the early settlers in Virginia which may deserve attention. This writer claims to have "carefully searched for facts." "Myths," says he, "creep into history," and he has employed his "hard steel pen" in tearing away the delicate web with which imagination has surrounded the beginnings of a great nation. The example he selects from "the accomplished Bancroft" is that of John Rolfe, an amiable enthusiast who had emigrated to Virginia hearing a voice crying in his ears that he should strive to make Pocahontas, a young Indian maiden, a Christian, and his wife. This is the substance of the account given by "the accomplished Bancroft," but this author states, as the result of his research, that Rolfe was a married man some years before this union. We do not know whether it is Bancroft or another writer who describes John Rolfe or Pocahontas, or both, as "constrained by the love of Christ"; but it is only too probable that both the method and language of Brigham Young were to some extent anticipated by the early pioneers of civilization. As regards Rolfe, the evidence produced by the author shows that he came with a white wife to Virginia in 1610, and had then a child by that wife, that he was married to Pocahontas in Virginia in 1614, brought her to England in 1616, and had a child by her. She died in England in 1617, and in 1622 Rolfe died, leaving a wife and children, besides the child he had by Pocahontas. It is consistent with these dates that Rolfe's

* *The Hudson from the Wilderness to the Sea.* By Benson J. Lossing. With 306 Illustrations from Designs by the Author. London: Virtue & Co. 1868.

The English Colonization of America during the Seventeenth Century. By Edward D. Neill, Consul of United States of America at Dublin. London: Strahan & Co. 1871.

The Original Lists of Persons of Quality, Emigrants, Religious Exiles, Political Rebels, Serving-men sold for a term of years, Apprentices, Children Stolen, Maidens Pressed, and others who went from Great Britain to the American Plantations, 1600-1700; with their Ages, the Localities where they formerly lived in the Mother-country, the Names of the Ships in which they embarked, and other interesting Particulars. From MSS. preserved in the State Paper Department of Her Majesty's Public Record Office, England. Edited by John Camden Hotten. London: Chatto & Windus. 1874.

first wife may have died before he married Pocahontas, and that, after the death of Pocahontas, he married a third wife and had children by her. But the story is perplexing, and it is difficult to believe that Rolfe did not commit bigamy in marrying the Virginian "princess," as she is called, "for the good and honour of the Plantation." It appears, moreover, that Sir Thomas Dale, the "religious and valiant Governor" of Virginia, proposed to marry a sister of Pocahontas, having at the time a wife living in England. On the whole, it would seem that the critic is nearer to the truth than the historian. Bancroft also states that the settlers of Maryland were "most of them Roman Catholic gentlemen," and the same critic says that he has reason to believe that these settlers were chiefly poor labouring men and Protestants.

It would be well if poor labouring men had been the worst material used in building the colonial edifice. But if the settlers were such as this author describes, we may be less surprised than he is at the "draconian code," as he calls it, which was enacted for Virginia. This code of 1612 prescribes death for blasphemy, and, on a third conviction, for profane swearing. For a want of proper respect to a clergyman one was publicly whipped, and obliged to ask pardon in church for three successive Sundays. The penalty for not attending church and the Sunday catechetical lesson was for the first offence the loss of a week's provisions, for the second whipping, and for the third death. If the colonist upon his arrival refused to go to the clergyman to give an account of his faith, he was daily whipped until he complied. If a washerwoman stole the linen of an employer she was to be publicly whipped. A baker who sold loaves below the standard weight was liable to lose his ears. The description given two years before by Lord Delaware, Captain-General of Virginia, of the community over which he ruled might, according to the ideas of that time, justify this severity. It is not, says he, an hundred or two of "deboisht hands," ill provided and worse governed, men of distempered bodies and infected minds, whom no examples either of goodness or punishment can deter from habitual impiety, that must be workers in this glorious building. He wants "men of quality, and painstaking men of arts and practices," but he would not altogether exclude "gentlemen." By "men of quality" he appears to mean men of character as opposed to "deboisht hands," and his appreciation of "gentlemen" does not greatly differ from that of an emigration agent of the present day. "Gentlemen" are an article of which a new colony may easily have too much. Notwithstanding the Captain-General's preference for "men of quality," he was obliged to yield to the resolution of the Home Government to shoot the moral rubbish of England on Virginia. King James I. sent a man "suspected of deer-stealing" for transportation to Virginia. The word "transportation" was not at this time used, as it afterwards came to be, in a penal sense. A poacher might make a useful settler, and at worst he would only imitate other colonists who preferred hunting to clearing and tilling ground. But soon afterwards the King informed the Virginian Company "that he wished divers dissolute persons transported," and the Company answered "that it would be very acceptable to the colonists to receive them as servants."

The author of the book from which we have quoted is described as Consul of the United States at Dublin. It can hardly be doubted that he writes with satisfaction the words "From this time there were two distinct waves of immigration, the educated and religious preferring the Northern because King James had made the Southern a penal colony." We do not suggest that he has intentionally dealt unfairly with facts, but he may have been insensibly biased in his conclusions by the passions and prejudices excited by recent strife. "Early in 1620," he says, "the first large instalment of vagabonds and destitute persons arrived in Virginia, and yearly their numbers increased." He quotes from a contemporary poet a wish that Jove

Would move King James, once more, to store that clime
With the Moll Cutpurses of our bad time.

But the poet's wish seems to apply to America generally. This is not the only instance in which a partiality may be suspected for the North. The author says that "the social position of the settlers in the Northern colony had been far superior," and he instances the Deputy Governor of Massachusetts and a settler at Salem who were married to daughters of the Countess of Lincoln. But surely against this may be set Lord Delaware, the Captain-General of Virginia, and George Percy, brother to the Earl of Northumberland, "one of the original settlers" in that colony. Thus Virginia can show two colonists of noble birth against two colonists of New England whose only nobility was gained by marriage. Still we cannot but give weight to the evidence of Sir Josiah Child, who wrote in 1698 that "Virginia and Barbadoes were first peopled by a sort of coarse vagrant people, vicious and destitute of means at home." The author states, we presume as the result of his own examination, that records show that Edinburgh used to banish what are now called unfortunate women to Virginia; and it is easy to understand that planters would accept any labour they could get, particularly as we find that in early years very few negroes were imported.

Upon the question thus arising the bulky volume lately published throws little light. We can see that there was considerable mortality in Virginia in the years to which it refers, and we find large numbers of "servants" on the muster-roll, of whom some, but scarcely all, may be what in newer colonies were called convicts. The names in the lists are ordinary English names which supply little indication as to the class, and none at all as to the character, of the colonists. Indeed this volume is as

barren of interesting facts as any that ever came under our notice, but if the genealogists of Virginia are as clever as they are said to be, they may perhaps discover in these dry records a significance unperceived by us. Almost the only part of the book that can convey any distinct impression to the ordinary reader is the "lists of convicted rebels sent to the Barbadoes and other plantations" after Monmouth's defeat in 1685. Not that even here the mere names convey ideas, but the business-like character of these records forcibly supplements the picture of the Bloody Assize which we find in Macaulay's pages. Thus we have "Sir William Booth's List of Prisoners." It would seem that Sir William Booth was a merchant or planter who invested largely in white slaves. The names and former abodes of a lot of ninety rebels are given, and we find men from Cheard, Tanton, West Zoyland, Hunspill, Burnam, Corfe, Creech, and many other familiar names. They were "shipt at Bristol," which was a great port for slave-dealing, white and black, and they were "consigned for the Barbadoes." Then there is a deposition by the chief mate of the ship that "the above convicted rebels" are "the very same rebels" that have been by him landed at this island, and delivered to Mr. John Brown & Co., factors for Sir William Booth, Knight, except thirteen out of the ninety, who died upon the voyage. Mr. Rose of London, and Mr. Nepho, appear also to have been large dealers in this commodity, which was made the subject of "invoices" and "bills of lading" like any other merchantable article. Macaulay bases his account of the sufferings of these "rebels" on their voyage partly on a manuscript narrative by John Coad, "an honest, God-fearing carpenter," who joined Monmouth, was badly wounded at Philip's Norton, was tried by Jeffreys, and was sent to Jamaica. One might understand better after perusing such a record the meaning of that text of Scripture which speaks of the "bread of affliction and the water of affliction" as prisoner's allowance. In those days, indeed, before philanthropy was invented, the petition in the Litany "for all prisoners and captives" had more significance than it has now, for, if Heaven did not help those who found themselves in gaol or transport-ship, they must have fared badly. Perhaps the "honest, God-fearing" ploughmen and artisans of Somersetshire did not live long enough in Barbadoes to qualify the character which the island seems to have derived from "the loose vagrant people" who first settled there. It appears from the parish register of Barbadoes for the year 1680 that by this time negroes had been imported to an amount more than threefold that of the "bought servants" who were supplied from England. It might be a curious inquiry whether convict labour in the American or West Indian colonies ever produced anything like the valuable results which are ascribed to it in Australia. Transportation to the American colonies continued until the Declaration of Independence, and among the colonies which received convicts were Delaware, New Jersey, New York, and Pennsylvania. The early colonists considered that the labour of convicts would be more beneficial to an infant settlement than their vices could be pernicious. But the importation of negro slaves soon lowered the value of convict labour, and it was thought dangerous to mix white men in a state of slavery with an increasing black slave population. A writer on this subject concludes that when no better labour was to be had the colonists were glad to take convicts. If this were so, it appears hopeless to represent the Southern States exclusively as receptacles of English outcasts. Perhaps the less said on the subject the better, but it connects itself rather disagreeably with any discussion on transatlantic pedigrees.

ROBY'S LATIN GRAMMAR.*

(Second Notice.)

IN selecting the dative from all the cases treated of under the head of noun-inflexions, we hoped to compress our remarks on this part of Mr. Roby's book into as short a compass as possible, and so to leave room for a notice of the other parts of the Syntax. But we fear there may be some amongst our readers who are not sufficiently familiar with Latin grammar, especially as it has been treated of late years, to appreciate the skill with which Mr. Roby has separated and discussed the two uses of the dative which he has called the dative of indirect object and the predicative dative. And as he has devoted some thirty pages of his preface to the illustration of this subject, we should scarcely be doing justice to him if we did not attempt to explain his view at greater length. For probably there is no part of his work which has been more elaborated than this. The term predicative is used, not as synonymous with, yet for the most part corresponding to, what have been called "datives of the purpose." The two following sentences when compared together will aptly illustrate the significance of the name, which is an invention of Mr. Roby's:—

Maximum vero argumentum est naturam ipsam de immortalitate animorum tacitam judicare quod omnibus curæ sunt et maximæ quidem quæ post mortem futura sint.

and—

Magnoque esse argumento homines scire pleraque antequam nati sint quod jam pueri ita celeriter res adripiant.

* A Grammar of the Latin Language from Plautus to Suetonius. By Henry John Roby, M.A., late Fellow of St. John's College, Cambridge. In two Parts. Part II. containing Book IV., Syntax; also Prepositions, &c. London: Macmillan & Co. 1874.

Or perhaps a still better illustration will be found in the following:—

Illis . . . inimicorum injuria probro non fuit . . . tuum scelus meum probrum putas esse oportere?

Mr. Roby speaks of this dative as being used predicatively, or, to use his own words, "The word put in this dative is a name of the thing or person of which it is predicated," and in this he thinks lies the characteristic note of the usage. He has taken the trouble to collect all the instances he could find of its use, to the number of nearly two hundred, under the heads of the different nouns so used. He thinks the list of predicative datives is tolerably complete, and undoubtedly we are unable to gainsay this position, though the smallness of the number does not seem to us such matter for wonder as Mr. Roby finds in it. Though the usage was fully developed at the time when Roman literature begins—for Plautus, he says, uses between forty and fifty words in this dative—the class of words which can occur in this relation is necessarily restricted within narrow limits, inasmuch as the usage scarcely extends beyond what he calls semi-abstract substantives, such as names of actions, effects, feelings; such, for instance, as *curæ, odio, præsidio, usui, moræ, ludibrio*. It is confined to the singular number, which again is natural when the abstract nature of the words so used is considered. He instances, amongst other contrasts of singular and plural, that *voluptati* is so used, but not *delictis*; *prædæ*, but not *manubis*; but in these, as well as in the other instances, the plural noun is much more of a concrete and less of an abstract character than the singular, so that this second character is, as it were, an instance of, or at least an offshoot from, the first—namely, that which confines its use, or nearly confines it, to semi-abstract substantives.

The care with which Mr. Roby has investigated this point may be judged of, not only from his enumeration of the nouns and the instances in which they are found so used, but also by the separate classification he has made of them in his own mind. For instance, he notices their great rarity in Martial and the younger Pliny; also, that, out of the whole number, not much more than a fifth can be pronounced to be of frequent occurrence, and about a third only have been found as often as five times. Again, after observing that the dative is used most frequently with *esse*, he adds that, of the whole number, 117 appear to be used only with *esse*, and 11 with other verbs and not with *esse*. Of these latter, he continues, only *vito, dono*, and perhaps *muneri*, are used often enough to make the non-occurrence of *esse* with them at all noticeable, though surely there is a distinction here to be made between the subjective and objective sense which mainly accounts for the rarity of usage. Nothing, in fact, that could be said on the subject seems to have escaped him, and he has here anticipated the objection that the scholar would be sure to allege, when he says (p. xxxi.) that

No doubt in all such matters we ought to bear constantly in mind what (to apply one of Darwin's phrases) I may call the imperfection of the philological record. There were a great many books written between Plautus and Tacitus which have perished altogether, and many expressions may have been common enough in the atrium and the forum, in the camp and on the farm, which have found but scanty recognition in a studied literature like the Roman. And the usage now in question, though capable of being applied to things of moment in a style elevated to the occasion, was yet mainly a usage of ordinary conversation.

It would perhaps have been worth Mr. Roby's while to add a catalogue of such words as do not occur used in this way with regard to which there is no obvious reason to be assigned why they should not be so used—e.g. *amicitiæ, indignationi, oblivioni, prætextui*, and others. Probably such a list would not be very long. Such a catalogue would have helped to decide the question whether the fact may be due to the imperfection of the record or the rare use of the words themselves in any relation, or whether any other reason is to be assigned for their non-appearance in this particular relation. It is not very satisfactory to be told that "there seems to have been on the one hand something which suggested abstract terms, and again an instinct which militated against an indiscriminate use of them."

We have dwelt longer on this subject than we at first intended, but perhaps it is the most interesting, as well as the most original, part of Mr. Roby's book. He sums up what he has to say as follows:—

That the usage is sufficiently distinct to demand a co-ordinate, not subordinate, rank to the indirect object appears to us the ultimate result to which we can at present attain. It may be historically a daughter, though so old as to look like a sister. Intermediate usages may be found, but such would almost inevitably exist even if the two classes have quite distinct origin. And till we know the precise meaning and history of the suffix which forms the dative case, it is impossible to be confident whether the tree had one trunk or two.

We proceed now to redeem the promise of our previous article—namely, to say a few words on Mr. Roby's treatment of the subjunctive mood. And here we find ourselves in the same difficulty that we experienced in regard to the noun-inflexions. It is impossible within our ordinary limits, even after we have made the special selection of the subjunctive mood, to give any adequate idea of the new method of classification which he has adopted. And we are moreover at a loss as to which of the seven chapters devoted to this mood we shall attempt to analyse. We must, however, first give an outline of the mode of division of the meanings and usages of the subjunctive, which is not materially different from that which the author put out in his "Elementary Latin Grammar" of 1862.

After premising that the general distinction between the indicative and the subjunctive is that the one expresses an action or event done or narrated, the other as thought or supposed, he proceeds to enumerate the eight main classes, which he arranges two and two in four different categories. Under the first head come two classes of sentences, which are called respectively hypothetical (A) and conditional (B) sentences, the former name being given to the apodosis only, the latter to the protasis only, of what are commonly called conditional sentences. The ambiguity contained in this new use of the word conditional sentence is somewhat puzzling. The following typical example will explain it:—*Fecerim si jusseris* and *si jusseris fecerim*, "I should be found to have," or "I should have done if you should have bidden," are classed under the head of hypothetical, as far as the apodosis *fecerim*, "I should have done," is concerned, and again under the head of conditional on account of the protasis, *si jusseris*, "If you should have bidden." And now Mr. Roby's explanation of his novel use of words will be intelligible. He says:—

As here used, therefore, the hypothesis is the action treated as contingent on another; the condition is that other action on which the first is contingent.

Under this first head of hypothetical (A) sentences one page is given of typical examples, and a considerable part of Chapter XX. is devoted to actual examples occurring in classical authors of its use; and in the heading of this chapter we have the more correct expression "clause" used for what in the nineteenth chapter is ambiguously termed "sentence." All these instances are printed on the left hand, each paragraph being numbered with an even number, the opposite page being filled with examples illustrative of the contrasted use of the indicative mood.

The general account given by Mr. Roby of the distinction is as follows:—

In these sentences, which readily admit of either the indicative or subjunctive mood, the subjunctive implies that the action spoken of is *not a fact*. Nothing is implied as to knowledge or want of knowledge, doubt or assurance, probability or improbability, possibility or impossibility, so far as the mood is concerned; but a non-real past action is of course impossible, a non-real future action is (apart from intrinsic impossibilities) possible.

There is only one other of the eight classes in which the subjunctive mood is found in simple or principal sentences; in all others it is in subordinate sentences. This is in sentences expressing a wish or command, treated in Chapter XXI, under the head of Optative and Jussive Subjunctive. Typical instances are such as *Pace horum dixerim* and *Utinam valeas*. But we must confine our attention to the hypothetical subjunctive—i.e. the subjunctive as it appears in the principal clause of a conditional sentence. The general statements which the parallel arrangement of sentences is made to illustrate are the following, which, for the sake of perspicuity, we now exhibit in parallel columns:—

An hypothetical subjunctive expresses an action which, while its non-occurrence is implied, is yet supposed to occur, if some other action occur.	The indicative makes a statement without implying that the action does not occur or (necessarily) that it does occur.
---	---

Without attempting to follow Mr. Roby through the rules which he proceeds to lay down for the use of the different tenses of the subjunctive in both clauses, we will pick out two or three of the shortest of his illustrative sentences, and arrange them in a similar way opposite to each other:—

<i>Tu si hic sis aliter sentias.</i>	<i>Si id facis, hodie postremum me vides.</i>
<i>Quos ni mea cura resistat, jam flammæ tulerint inimice et hausserint ensis.</i>	<i>Si enim rationem hominibus Di dederunt, malitiam dederunt.</i>
<i>Si aut collegam, id quod mallem, tui similem haberes aut tu collegæ tui esses similis, supervacanea esset oratio mea.</i>	<i>Metellum si parum pudor ipsius defendebat, debebat familia nostræ dignitas satis sublevare.</i>
<i>Ergo ego nisi peperissem, Roma non oppugnaretur; nisi filium haberem, libera in libera patria moritura essem.</i>	<i>Cesseram, si alienam a me plebem fuisse vultis, quæ non fuit, invidia; si vis suberat, armis; si periculum civium, reipublicæ.</i>

This parallel arrangement of the use of the indicative and subjunctive moods in sentences which have a considerable resemblance to each other, and where the distinction of meaning is slight, is one of the most useful parts of Mr. Roby's Grammar. It may be a question whether he has classified these minute distinctions in the best possible way, but he has unquestionably given ample facilities to any one who may object to his theory to propound another which shall suit all the circumstances of the case better. For other instances of the comparative use of the two moods we must refer to the sections 1532, 1533, from which all the above extracts have been selected; but those we have given will perhaps be sufficient to enable an ordinary scholar to follow Mr. Roby in the account which he has given of this subject in his Introduction. He says:—

The use and meaning of the subjunctive in hypothetical and conditional sentences is, I think, often misapprehended. The indicative is often said to be used only when the condition is a fact or when it is only an apparent condition. The subjunctive present is said to be used when an event is regarded as probable or possible; the imperfect, where it is regarded as improbable or impossible. I have ventured to deny these views. The matter, I take it, stands really thus. The indicative is a simple combination of subject and predicate and has of itself no special meaning. The subjunctive has been formed, or at least is applied, in order to warn the hearer that the event is *thought* and only thought. The indicative by contrast with this gets a sub-implication of fact. The subjunctive, again, by a secondary contrast gets (in certain classes of sentences) the special implication of—
Now the statements used in hypothetical and conditional clauses

able in the speaker's mind and intention (we have nothing to do with the objective reality) either to fact, or to not fact, or to a neutral head. In other words, I either put a case avowedly as a fact or avowedly as not a fact, or I put it simply without meaning to imply either the one or the other. This intermediate class is of course a thought, and might have been left to the subjunctive mood. But this is not what the Romans have done. The subjunctive with them in such sentences means distinctly *not fact*, and the class of fact and the neutral class are given to the indicative.

To do Mr. Roby's theory full justice we ought to have extracted the whole of the rest of this page. We may observe that the theory which he attacks, though imperfect, has at least the merit of being intelligible and of easy application. On the other hand, if his theory be pressed, there ought to be no use of the pluperfect indicative, which, as he observes, is the most thoroughly past tense, in hypothetical clauses. He observes that it is *rare* in hypothetical sentences, except as a wilful exaggeration, and rare in conditional clauses, except when it denotes facts. He does not appear to us to have taken into consideration, or at least not to have noticed prominently enough, the poetical use, which is not uncommon, such as—*Robustæque fores munierant satis, Si non Acrisium Juppiter et Venus risissent*. We have precisely the same poetical use in English. The poetical and quasi-poetical use may, however, be regarded, as Mr. Roby seems to regard them, as something like the *exceptio quæ probat regulam*.

We have only just touched two of the eight uses of the subjunctive mood as laid down in this grammar. It would not be possible to criticize or even to notice the remaining uses without doubling the length of this already long article. Moreover, we have left unnoticed the Introduction and the Supplement to the Syntax. We regret that we must here for the present, though reluctantly, part with a book which is very suggestive of thought in other directions than those which we have indicated.

KATE BYRNE.*

"MEN in love," says the author of this story, "seldom moralize." It is much to be wished then, we cried out as we came to this passage, that all novel-writers, whether male or female, were always in love. We should in that case be spared a good deal of very dull writing. *Kate Byrne* is avowedly written with a moral. "We have tried to show," says the author, "how a beautiful woman failed to find any contentment or happiness in marrying for wealth and position a man whom she did not love, and with whom she had no tastes or wishes in common." Part of the demonstration, by the way, depends on the death of her only child three days or so after birth. If the child had lived the marriage might, so far as we can see, have been happy enough. The beautiful young women whom the author would keep from marrying lords who have a good chance of a dukedom might with reason rely on the statistics of infant mortality among the aristocracy, and with no great imprudence might stake their happiness on the chance of an heir. It would be just as well, however, for lords in general to think twice before they marry a mercenary heroine. Their life is likely to be a short one, and far from merry. When a heroine has to be reformed, and made to see the error of her ways, human life counts for nothing. One victim after another is swept away—even the aristocracy is not spared—till, widowed, childless, and an orphan, she becomes properly penitent in the last chapter. "We have followed her," says the author in writing of her heroine, "through a few years of fashionable slavery and dissipation, until by a merciful interposition of Providence her plans for a last struggle for some peace and independence were frustrated, and she was led back to her wifely duty." Whether Lord Denton, if he had been well enough to consider the question, would have regarded the fit which after a short illness carried him off as a merciful interposition of Providence, may be doubted. It taught Lady Denton no doubt her wifely duty, but, as he lived only a few weeks to enjoy her penitence, he may have thought that it was paying rather too dear for his whistle. He is introduced to us as a large landed proprietor, in appearance more jolly than gentlemanly, and as one able to offer all the luxuries this world can give. We might with good reason have argued that, as he was not the one chiefly to blame for the unhappiness of their married life, and as nevertheless he was quite as much in need of reformation as his wife, he deserved no less than she a merciful interposition. If the story had been written from a different point of view, it would have been the wife who was killed, while her noble husband in his penitent sorrow would never again have taken "a bumper of brandy and soda-water," but would have become President of the Teetotal Association.

The plot of the story is simple enough. *Kate Byrne*, "a queenly creature," as she is called, is in love with Bartle Blake, but will not marry him, because he is poor. Helen, or Ellen, Leigh—for her name varies—is also in love with him, but has no objection to poverty. Kate marries Lord Denton, as we have said, and repents. Helen marries Blake, and does not repent. Kate, however, does very well in the end, for not only does she live a highly virtuous life at Denton Court, devoted to her old aunt and her stepson the Duke, but when he married a blue-eyed gentle girl—the third blue-eyed girl of the story—and has children, she is to them "their beautiful stately grandmamma Denton." We cannot but fear that if the punishment that attends on marrying for money is nothing worse than a merciful dispensation by

which the husband is carried off by a fit, while solid comfort is left in a title, "an ample allowance," and the devoted affection of a Duke, we shall have all the novel-reading young ladies of the day ready to follow in the heroine's steps. The plot is now and then enlivened by an incident or two. On one occasion the heroine sprains her ankle, and on another she has a remarkable encounter with some burglars. The burglars have nothing at all to do with the story, except so far as they give the heroine an opportunity of showing her presence of mind by seizing one of them by the hair, and her lover, Lord Denton, an opportunity of expressing his desire "to horsewhip the wretch" who had frightened Kate. She had been awakened up by a noise. She listened. "The extreme silence of the house made her feel almost nervous, and her heart beat quickly and loudly." What her heart would have done if she had been quite nervous we are not told. She thought that "if she only dared show herself in white, that might frighten them perhaps; thieves were always cowards she knew." She went out of her room, and downstairs:—

She made one or two steps forward into the hall, when, to her intense surprise, she saw distinctly a dark figure coming towards her—a man—a thief, a robber. Oh, heavens! She could not move or speak. The man carried something in his arms, and he also came to a standstill, and did not speak. A deep sigh, which Kate made in her effort to articulate, caused the man to start and drop what he held out of his arms—it was the silver commonly in use from the pantry. The crash gave Kate courage, and, without moving a step, and putting out her hand, she said, in a deep low voice, "What are you doing here?" The man gave one bound past her, towards the dining-room door; but quick as lightning she darted forward, held him by his coat and hair, and screamed loudly, "Fire! murder! murder!" In much less time than it takes to write this, Norah and Bates had come to Kate's assistance. Bates had heard the fall of the silver, and struck a light; immediately hearing Kate's screams, he had come, just as he was, to the rescue. Then Mrs. and Miss Leigh, and Miss Castaldi, with the other servants, came down, half awake and terribly frightened; and when the former fully realized the danger Kate had been in, they were quite overcome, and could scarcely believe she was not at all hurt. The coachman was sent for from the Lodge, and, with Bates, guarded the prisoner till he was willingly resigned to the tender care and protection of the village constable. That worthy person seemed to regret deeply that he had not had the pleasure of catching the aforesaid individual.

Let not our readers imagine that this incident is a specimen of what they may chiefly expect to find in the book. There is a good deal of bad English, but of really bad characters there is a remarkable scarcity. "How is it," the author asks, "that most elderly people (especially gentlemen) seem to have such pleasure in the constant repetition of their pet jokes and stories?" "How is it," we might in our turn ask, "that so many young people (especially ladies) have such pleasure in hashing up the same old plots and serving them up as if they were new stories?" We might go on to add, "How wonderfully good-natured their listeners need to be to show any sort or kind of interest, or listen with patience to what is so very old and often very stupid." We, for our part, have a great deal of respect for an old man's story. That we have laughed at it any time these twenty years establishes, we admit, an obligation on us to laugh at it once more. Among the privileges to which old age is entitled, Cicero in his "Cato Major" does not indeed reckon this, which we hold to be by no means the least in importance, that its old jests should always pass current as new. Perhaps in Cato's time the story of old grouse in the gun-room was not known. However much we may respect the jokes and stories of the old, we see no reason for showing the least regard to the stories of the young. We are certainly entitled to ask that before they publish they should at least learn how to write. It would be well also if, before they tried to paint character, they first made it their study. As Douglas Jerrold said, before you take down the shutters you should furnish the shop. We doubt not that *Kate Byrne* will find its readers. It is no duller than a tract. It has, as we have said, a moral, and there are not a few readers who as much require a moral for their novel as they do sugar for their tea. The story is to be sure so dull that it puts the reader to sleep, but there are not a few readers who regard sleep as the final cause of reading. Those, on the contrary, who think that novels are written and sermons preached rather for our waking than our sleeping hours may possibly find something to rouse their interest in the good society in which they are kept. We, for our part, managed to keep ourselves from nodding over *Kate Byrne* by having an eye to the foolish expressions and the grammatical errors we could detect, just as we have at times kept awake through a sermon by counting the heresies into which the preacher has fallen. Bad though the errors are, it is not often that we find a sentence quite so unintelligible as the following:—

It was a kind of nursery for the invalids; and it was his coming to bring and see after a recent valuable purchase that had enabled the Clennings to invite and persuade him to accept their offer of a few days' visit during the coming-of-age festivities.

A few pages earlier we have a specimen of the confusion into which the author gets when she attempts a parenthesis. It would be just as well, by the way, if at young ladies' schools they taught, with the use of the globes, the use also of brackets. Our novelists would in this case have more chance of avoiding such errors as those contained in the following sentence:—

The truth was, that he had been so taken up with Mrs. Leigh and Helen when he first came in (which, considering the time that had elapsed since he had seen the former, was hardly to be wondered at), and having seen Kate at the Hall only an hour or two before, he had scarcely noticed her, beyond bowing to her as he entered.

To make up for such slips as this the author can, when she pleases, get some very fine words out of very common-

* *Kate Byrne. A Novel.* By S. Howard-Taylor. 2 vols. London: Samuel Tinsley. 1874.

place matters. The arrival of a heroine is certainly a matter of some importance, but unless she can be brought in a balloon or on an elephant, the vehicle in which she comes may as well be kept in the background. Not so thinks our author. "Mrs. Leigh and Helen were on the platform, waiting the arrival of the 'iron horse' which was to bring their expected guest. The huge machinery had scarcely come to a stand-still before Kate was in Helen's arms." Happily there she is left, and so no big names are found for the porter and his barrow. Kate, before she had decided not to accept Bartle Blake, had leant upon "her fair jewelled hand," and indulged in "cogitations." Her father had "a gloomy kind of presentiment" about the course she was going to take. Whereupon, as we knew would be the case, the author asks, "Who can say that we do not all sometimes have shadowy glimpses of coming trouble?" We have often noticed that when a writer introduces any piece of superstitious nonsense into his book he at once follows it up by asking a question. It turns the tables, as it were, on the rash sceptic who, he knows, is ready to laugh at him. The heroine has a dreadful dream, and was, as she described herself, "in a perfect state of fear and suffering." When she first comes to Denton Court "the old-fashioned furniture was to be replaced by modern elegant additions or substitutes." Allowing that a substitute can be said to replace, we are somewhat puzzled about the addition. At her marriage there were in the church "exclamations of delight and satisfaction at the elegant appearance of the whole party." Her husband condescends, as so great a nobleman should, to the use of more familiar language, for he addresses her as "my peerless Kitty." A lady in the story "tried to pour heaps of contrite excuses in Lady Denton's ear," while Helen, the rival heroine, seeing Bartle Blake at the opera, asks "Isn't it him?" The young Duke had a great regard for his tutor's wife, "who (sic) he wrote to every week." The day Lord Denton was seized with the fit his wife "several times fancied she could hear him saying, 'Good-bye, Kate; don't wait dinner for me,' to which she replied with a bend of her head, as she thought it something what he used to do before they drifted so far apart."

There is only one sensible thing said in the whole book. We have no reason to believe, however, that the author intended to be sensible. Helen, the good heroine, after she had said she should wish Blake to marry some one very nice, added—"I can't very well explain the meaning I have for that pet word of mine." A schoolboy might as well try to give a definition of "jolly" as a young lady of "nice." In Ceylon they reckon up the hundred uses, as different as can be, to which the palm-tree can be put. Even the palm-tree falls far short of this little English word. We are not sure, indeed, if after all we might not, with a safe conscience, describe *Kate Byrne* as a very nice book.

NOTICE.

We beg leave to state that we decline to return rejected Communications; and to this rule we can make no exception.

PARIS.

Copies of the SATURDAY REVIEW may be obtained every Saturday of M. FOTHERINGHAM, 8 Rue Neuve des Capucines.

The SATURDAY REVIEW is duly registered for transmission abroad.

THE SATURDAY REVIEW

OF

POLITICS, LITERATURE, SCIENCE, AND ART.

Price 6d.

CONTENTS OF No. 992, OCTOBER 31, 1874:

- | | | | |
|---|---|--------------------------|---------|
| The Government of London. | Germany. | The Two Law Officers. | |
| The Brussels Conference. | Socialist Agitators. | Nana Sahib. | France. |
| | Irrigation in India. | | |
| Mechanical Humour. | | | |
| Switzerland in Italy. | English Clergymen in Foreign Watering-places. | | |
| The "Synoptical Tables" of the Universities Commission. | | | |
| A Protestant View of the Park Laws. | High Art Finance. | | |
| Liability of Railway Companies for Delay. | Poachers. | The Uses of Regalia. | |
| | The Cambridgeshire. | | |
| Green and Grose's Hume. | Samuel Lover. | | |
| Seebohm's Protestant Revolution. | Hikayat-i-Abdullah. | Geiger's Peep at Mexico. | |
| Thomas's Diocese of St. Asaph. | Transatlantic Pedigrees. | | |
| Roby's Latin Grammar. | Kate Byrne. | | |

CONTENTS OF No. 991, OCTOBER 24, 1874:

- The Prince of Wales in France—The Government of London—Spain—Opposition Criticisms—The French Elections—Politics in America—A Philosopher's Legacy—The Scotch Education Report.
- Hypothetical History—Mr. Ruskin on Mr. Ruskin—The Lesson of the Regent's Park Explosion—Much Wenlock—Sacredotalism—Trevies—The Paris Stago—Life in Spain—The Cultivation of Brutality—The Theatres.
- Lord Lytton's Speeches—Grove's Correlation of Physical Forces—Idolatry—General Sherman on War—Koludewy's Arctic Expedition—Russian Advance Eastward—The Magic Mirror—Lindsay's History of Merchant Shipping—Cloely—American Literature.

London: Published at 38 SOUTHAMPTON STREET, STRAND, W.C.

ADVERTISEMENTS.

DORÉ'S GREAT PICTURE OF "CHRIST LEAVING THE PRÆTORIUM," with "The Dream of Pilate's Wife," "Night of the Crucifixion," "Christian Martyrs," "Froncesca da Rimini," "Andromeda," &c., at the DORÉ GALLERY, 39 New Bond Street. Ten to Six—Admission, 1s.

THE SCOTTISH CORPORATION.

President.

H.R.H. the PRINCE OF WALES, Duke of ROTHESAY, K.C., &c.

Vice-Presidents.

His Grace the Duke of ROXBURGHE, K.T.

His Grace the Duke of BUCCLEUCH, K.G.

His Grace the Duke of RICHMOND and LENNOX, K.G.

His Grace the Duke of MONTROSE, K.T.

The Right Hon. the Earl of LAUDERDALE, K.C.B.

The Right Hon. the Earl of ROSEBURY.

The TWO HUNDRED and TENTH ANNIVERSARY FESTIVAL of this Corporation will take place at the Freemasons' Tavern on St. Andrew's Day, Monday, November 30, when the Most Hon. the Marquis of HUNTLY, the Premier Marquis of Scotland, will occupy the Chair.

N.B.—For the first and Preliminary List of Stewards see the "Times" of Saturday, October 31.

Subscriptions and Donations from Noblemen and Gentlemen who may not find it convenient to attend the Festival will be gratefully acknowledged and announced on St. Andrew's Day. Applications for Tickets, One Guinea each, ought to be made to the Managing Stewards at the Hall.

The Scottish Corporation Hall, E.C., October 23, 1874.

MACRAE MOIR.

SUNDAY LECTURE SOCIETY.—The LECTURES will be RESUMED at St. George's Hall, Langham Place, on Sunday Afternoon, November 1. Professor W. K. CLIFFORD, M.A. (Cambr.), F.R.S., on "BODY and MIND," at Four o'Clock precisely. Member's Annual Subscription, 2s. Payment at the doors, 1d., 6d., and (Reserved Seats) 1s.

QUEEN'S COLLEGE, 43 and 45 Harley Street, W.

Incorporated by Royal Charter, 1833, for the General Education of Ladies, and for granting Certificates of Knowledge.

Patrons.

HER MAJESTY THE QUEEN.

H.R.H. the PRINCESS OF WALES.

Visitor.—The LORD BISHOP OF LONDON.

The HALF-TERM for the College and School will begin on Thursday, November 5. Prospectuses may be had on application to Miss GROVE, at the College Office.

E. H. PLUMPTRE, Dean.

MALVERN COLLEGE.

This College contains two Departments—the CLASSICAL and the MODERN. There is also a preparatory LOWER SCHOOL.

There are Boarding-Houses within the College Grounds, held by the Head-Master and others of his Staff; a Gymnasium, &c.

Board and Tuition under Fourteen, £50; over Fourteen, £50. Non-Shareholders pay an extra Fee of 6s. Special advantages for Sons of Clergymen and Home Boarders.

For further information apply to the Rev. ARTHUR FABER, M.A., Head-Master, late Fellow and Tutor of New College, Oxford.

The Examination for Scholarships and Exhibitions on December 22 and 23.

MALVERN COLLEGE.

THE ANNUAL EXAMINATION for SCHOLARSHIPS and EXHIBITIONS will be held on December 22 and 23. There will be awarded Six House Scholarships of £50, Four Founders' Scholarships of £50, and some Exhibitions of £50. The Awards will be for one, two, or three years, according to merit, in Classics or Mathematics. For particulars apply to the HEAD-MASTER.

ELIZABETH COLLEGE, GUERNSEY.

Visitor.—The BISHOP OF WINCHESTER.

Valuable University Scholarships and College Exhibitions for annual competition. Special attention paid to Modern Languages and the Preparation of Candidates for Woolwich, Cooper's Hill, Control Department, Army and Navy, and Civil Service.

TO HEAD-MASTERS of PUBLIC SCHOOLS.—A

CLERGYMAN, late Fellow of his College, who has had long experience, and considerable success in the preparation of Pupils for the various Competitive Examinations, would be glad to undertake the MANAGEMENT of the SPECIAL DEPARTMENT in a Public School. His chief motive in seeking such a post is to enable Candidates to complete their preparation without losing the wholesome influence of Public School training, and without the risk and danger which attend their removal to Private Establishments.—Address, M.A., care of Mr. R. Clifford Foulter, 44 Middle Temple Lane, E.C.

FOLKESTONE.—Mr. W. J. JEFFERSON, M.A. Oxon.

(Formerly Principal of the Elphinstone High School, Bombay), with the Assistance of a Cambridge Honour-Man, prepares PUPILS for the Universities, Indian Civil Service, Woolwich, and all Competitive Examinations.—Terms and References on application.

EDUCATION for BOYS, free alike from Clerical and Dissenting

Influence, in the Family of a Layman, a CAMBRIDGE M.A. of much Experience. Ages, Ten to Fourteen. Terms high.—Address, THEOBALD, Messrs. Kerby & Endean, Publishers and Booksellers, 190 Oxford Street.

WANTED, a LADY, as HEAD-MISTRESS, for La Martinière.

Endowed Girls' School, Calcutta. Salary, £200 a year, with Board and Lodging.—Written applications received by Dr. MACANABARA, 38 Palace Gardens Terrace, W.

TO INVALIDS.—An elderly GENTLEWOMAN, accustomed

to Invalids, and an experienced Traveller, is open to an ENGAGEMENT with an Invalid Lady going Abroad for the Winter. A good Header and Amanteuse. Unexceptionable references given and required.—Address, A. B., 41 Lansdowne Crescent, Great Malvern.

PARTNERSHIP, ACTIVE or SLEEPING.—REQUIRED,

for a well-established MANUFACTURING BUSINESS, an Active or Sleeping PARTNER, with £5,000 to £10,000. References must be first class.—Apply by letter to Messrs. HENRY KIMBER & Co., Solicitors, 79 Lombard Street, London.

MALVERN.—HYDROPATHY.—Dr. RAYNER'S ESTABLISHMENT

(formerly Drs. Wilson and Rayner). For prospectus apply to T. RAYNER, M.D., Malvern.

HYDROPATHY.—SUDBROOK PARK, Richmond Hill.

Physician.—Dr. EDWARD LANE, M.A., M.D., Edin.

For Invalids and those requiring rest and change. Turkish Baths on the premises.

BRIGHTON.—BEDFORD HOTEL.—Facing Sea and

Esplanade. Near the West Pier. Central and quiet. Long established. Suites of Rooms. Spacious Coffee-room for Ladies and Gentlemen. Sea-Water Service in the Hotel.

ROBERT PARK, Manager.

ILFRACOMBE HOTEL, Ilfracombe, North Devon.—Delightful

Location. Beautiful Scenery. 250 Rooms. Appointments perfect. Cuisine excellent. Wines choice. Accessible from all parts by Steam and Rail (see Time Tables).

PUBLICATION of EDUCATIONAL WORKS.—All

AUTHORS desirous of bringing their WORKS under the direct notice of the Scholastic Profession are informed that RELFE BROTHERS have unusual opportunities of assisting them in this respect, as their Travellers, who visit the greater part of England twice a year, call on all the principal Educational Establishments in the Kingdom, and by this means introduce, in the most efficient way, all Books committed to their care.—6 Charterhouse Buildings, Aldersgate, E.C.

RODRIGUES' MONOGRAMS, ARMS, CRESTS, and

ADDRESSES Designed, and Steel Dies Engraved on Gems.

RAISED, RUSTIC, GROTESQUE, and ECCENTRIC MONOGRAMS artistically designed for any combination of Letters. NOTE PAPER and ENVELOPES Stamped in Colour Relief, and brilliantly Illuminated in Gold, Silver, and Colours, in the highest Style of Art.

At HENRY RODRIGUES', 48 PICCADILLY, LONDON.

THE ASTRONOMER-ROYAL Reported to the Admiralty (August 13, 1870) on 40 Chronometers entered for annual competition, "M. F. DENT's is the finest we have ever had on trial."—M. F. DENT, Chronometer, Watch, and Clock Maker to the Queen, 33 COCKSPUR STREET, CHANCERY CROSS.

E. DENT & CO., 61 Strand, and 34 Royal Exchange, Manufacturers of CHRONOMETERS, WATCHES, ASTRONOMICAL and TURRET CLOCKS, to Her Majesty, H.R.H. the Prince of Wales, and H.M. the Emperor of Russia; Makers of the Great Clock of the Houses of Parliament, and of the New Standard Clock of the Royal Observatory, Greenwich. Catalogues on application.—**E. DENT & CO.,** 61 Strand, 34 Royal Exchange (adjoining Lloyd's), and Factory, Savoy Street, London.

COAL ECONOMISING STOVES.—FENDERS, FIREIRONS, KITCHEN RANGES, CHIMNEY-PIECES, and COAL-BOXES.—**WILLIAM S. BURTON** begs to draw attention to his large stock of the above, and especially to two NEW PATENT STOVES for economising the use of coal while increasing the amount of heat, which can be seen in operation in his show-rooms. In one of these stoves the coal consumed is only one pound per hour.

	£	s.	d.	£	s.	d.
Black Register Stoves	9	0	to 15	18	0	0
Bright Steel do.	3	12	to 36	0	0	0
Bronzed or Black Fenders	3	3	to 10	2	0	0
Steel and Ormolu do.	10	0	to 20	15	0	0
Fireirons, per set	4	6	to 6	10	0	0
Chimney-pieces	1	10	to 100	0	0	0
Coal-boxes	2	4	to 10	0	0	0

COAL SCOOPS.—**WILLIAM S. BURTON** has 400 different Patterns of COAL SCOOPS on SHOW, of which he invites inspection. The Prices vary from 2s. 6d. to 15s. Plain Black open Scoops, from 2s. 6d.; do. do., zinc-lined, from 3s. 3d.; covered Box Scoops, from 6s.; ditto, with Hand-Scoop, from 8s. 6d.; do. do., with fancy ornamentation, from 14s.; highly finished and ornamented, and fitted with imitation ivory handles, from 22s. to 15s. There is also a choice selection of Wooden Coal Boxes, with iron and brass mountings, from 4s. to 15s.

WILLIAM S. BURTON, General Furnishing Ironmonger, by appointment to H.R.H. the Prince of Wales, sends a CATALOGUE, containing upwards of 800 Illustrations of his unrivalled Stock, with Lists of Prices and Plans of the 30 large Show-rooms, postage free.—39 Oxford Street, W.; 1, 1a, 2, 3, and 4 Newman Street; 4, 5, and 6 Perry's Place; and 1 Newman Yard, London, W. The Cost of delivering Goods to the most distant parts of the United Kingdom by Railway is trifling. **WILLIAM S. BURTON** will always undertake delivery at a small fixed rate.

FURNISH YOUR HOUSE at DEANE & COMPANY'S.

Illustrated Catalogue, with priced Furnishing List, post free.
Fenders—Bright, 4s. to 15s.; Bronze, 3s. to 25s.
Stoves—Bright, Black, Register, Hot-air, &c.
Baths—Domestic, Fixed, and Travelling.
Bedsteads—Brass and Iron, with Bedding.
Cornices—Cornice-poles, Ends, Bands, &c.
Gasaliers—2-light, 17s.; 3 do. 52s.; 5 do. 45s.
Kitchens—From 3 ft. 6 in. to 6 ft. 6 in.
Kitchen Utensils, Turnery, Mats, &c.
Garden Tools—Lawn-Mowers, Rollers, &c.
A Discount of Five per cent. for Cash Payments of £2 and upwards.

DEANE & COMPANY, 46 King William Street, London Bridge, E.C. Established A.D. 1700.

MAPPIN & WEBB'S

ALL SPOONS and FORKS.

GUARANTEED to LAST

TWENTY YEARS. A WRITTEN GUARANTEE GIVEN TO EVERY PURCHASER.

NOS. 76, 77, and 78 OXFORD STREET, WEST END, LONDON.

MANSION HOUSE BUILDINGS, QUEEN VICTORIA STREET, CITY, LONDON.

MANUFACTORY and SHOW ROOMS, THE ROYAL CUTLERY WORKS, SHEFFIELD. COSTLY ILLUSTRATED CATALOGUES ON RECEIPT OF 12 STAMPS. SMALLER EDITION POST FREE.

FURNISH YOUR HOUSE or APARTMENTS THROUGHOUT on MOEDER'S HIRE SYSTEM. Cash Prices; no Extra Charges. Large, useful Stock to select from. All Goods Warranted. Illustrated priced Catalogue, with Terms, post free.—249 and 250 Tottenham Court Road. Established 1862.

GOOD FLOOR CLOTH.—TRELOAR & SONS, 69 LUDGATE HILL, LONDON.

CARPETS, MESSRS. SMEE have now for SALE in this Department a certain number of

REMNANT LENGTHS and MADE-UP CARPETS, Which are offered (for such quantities only of each pattern as may be in Stock) at CONSIDERABLY REDUCED PRICES FOR CASH, WITHOUT DISCOUNT. 6 FINSBURY PAVEMENT, LONDON.

CLARK'S PATENT STEEL NOISELESS SHUTTERS, Self-Colling, Fire and Theft Proof, can be adapted to any Window or other Opening. Prospectuses from CLARK & CO., Sole Patentees, Bathbone Place, W.; Paris, Manchester, Liverpool, and Dublin.

HIGH-CLASS FASHIONABLE CLOTHING FOR GENTLEMEN PAYING CASH. LAWRENCE D. PHILLIPS & CO., COURT and MILITARY TAILORS, 13 GEORGE STREET, HANOVER SQUARE, LONDON, W.

A Fashionable Order Trade of the highest class, established for half-a-century on the credit system, but now doing business exclusively for ready money payment, and supplying Clothes and Uniforms of the best quality, to Order only, at moderate prices. Lists on application.

H. J. NICOLL, Merchant Clothier to the Queen, the Royal Family, and the Courts of Europe; Army, Navy, and Civil Outfitter, 114, 116, 118, 120 Regent Street, and 22 Cornhill, London. Also Branch Establishment at Manchester, 10 Mosley Street; Liverpool, 50 Bold Street; and Birmingham, 30 New Street.

The EARLIER FASHIONS for the approaching WINTER are now ready, and to be had at the above addresses. The Stock will be found to embrace much that is novel and approved in Style, in combination with Materials of sterling value and good wearing properties, while the make and finish of each Article are attended to with great care.

FOR GENTLEMEN.—Several Fashionable Novelties in Style and Material. The OVERCOATS are prepared. Very choice Fabrics for Frock and Morning Coats, &c. Homespun Cheviots for Suits. Distinguishing Patterns in Angoras for Trouserings.

FOR BOYS.—Very tasteful DESIGNS in SUITS, &c., for Younger Boys; and "Regulation" Suits, as worn at Eton, Harrow, Rugby, and other great Schools. Shirts, Hosiery, Hats, &c., suitable for each Dress.

FOR LADIES.—Several new DESIGNS in POLONAISE COSTUMES and JACKETS, amongst which are the "Beatrice" and "Russian Navy." Being made of Woolen Fabrics, the same skill in fitting and workmanship is required as in the production of Gentlemen's Clothing and Ladies' Riding Habits. The Ladies' Ulster "Broadcloth," with Self-Contracting Waist-Belt, introduced and registered by H. J. NICOLL, for Walking or Travelling, is rain-repellent, and yet thoroughly evaporable.

To be had only at H. J. NICOLL'S several Addresses, 114, 116, 118, 120 Regent Street, and 22 Cornhill, London; 10 Mosley Street, Manchester; 50 Bold Street, Liverpool; and 30 New Street, Birmingham.

IRON WINE BINS.—VIENNA MEDAL awarded to FARROW & JACKSON, 18 Great Tower Street, and 4 Haymarket, London, to whom is now transferred the sale of Barlow's Oak Stands and Syphon Taps, from 14 King William Street.

PHOENIX FIRE OFFICE, LOMBARD STREET and CHARING CROSS, LONDON.—ESTABLISHED 1792. Prompt and liberal Loss Settlements. Insurances effected in all parts of the World.

GEORGE WM. LOVELL } Secretaries.
JOHN J. BROOMFIELD }

PROVINCE of ONTARIO (CANADA).—CANADA MUNICIPAL BONDS.

FOR SALE. Debentures of Counties, Towns, and other Municipalities in the Province of Ontario, Dominion of Canada, at prices yielding between Six and Seven per Cent. Interest, and payable in sterling in London.

The Colonial Trusts Corporation (Limited), as Agents for the Province of Ontario, under whose authority these municipal Debentures are issued, offer them to investors on the terms and for the respective municipalities as stated below.

These Debts, which have all been incurred in aid of Railways and other public works, constitute in each case a first mortgage charge on the respective municipal revenues and assessable property. These revenues are ample in every case, and to the extent required by the obligations are administered for the Debenture-holders by the Province, which also guarantees the Holder's title.

The Debentures fall due over a term from December 31, 1880, to August 31, 1893. The price ranges from £20 10s. for those of 1880, to £24 for the longest term, 1893. Of the total of £261,600, those falling due in 1893 amount to £219,400. The Interest is due half-yearly, on June 30 and December 31.

The Terms of Purchase are Ten per Cent. on application, and the balance on allotment and delivery of the Bonds. The prices are net, ex accrued Interest, which purchasers have to pay up from June 30 last. All further particulars will be given on application at the Offices of the Agents.

COLONIAL TRUSTS CORPORATION, LIMITED. 31 Palmerston Buildings, Old Broad Street, London.

Deposits and other Payments are to be made to their Bankers, Messrs. GLYNS, MILLS, CURRIE & CO., Lombard Street.

Municipality.	Amount of Debentures.	Assessable Property.	Population.
Chatham (Town)	£21,200	\$209,221	6,041
Brantford	23,600	234,927	7,952
Cobourg	14,200	254,446	4,170
Godfrich	12,100	198,198	4,250
Guelph	10,200	411,596	7,798
Peterborough (Town)	14,800	311,561	4,217
Port Hope	19,000	304,076	5,522
Stratford	10,900	416,183	6,101
St. Catharines	22,900	625,552	8,503
Lindsay	3,500	172,594	4,076
Hope (Township)	7,100	176,328	3,447
Opa	3,500	78,095	3,198
London (City)	99,400	1,215,146	16,709
Northumberland and Durham (Counties)	45,800	2,217,832	58,167
Perth (County)	28,400	2,270,734	33,383

ISSUE of 6,500 SEVEN-AND-A-HALF PER CENT. PREFERRED SHARES of £10 each, entitled to further participation in Profits, after payment of a similar rate of Dividend on 3,500 Deferred Shares.

HOMER HILL COLLIERY COMPANY, LIMITED.

Directors. JOHN ABRAHAM, Esq., Northfield, Director of the Birmingham Small Arms and Metal Company, Limited.

STEPHEN BARKER, Esq., Calthorpe Fields, Edgbaston, Director of Muntz's Metal Company, Limited.

THOMAS BARKER, Esq., Beacon Hall, Lichfield, Director of the Chillington Iron Company, Limited.

JOHN KING, Esq., Bennett's Hill, Birmingham (of the firm of J. C. Abbott & Co., Coal Merchants).

J. S. EVERS SWINDELL, Esq., Summer Hill, Kingswinford, Dudley, Ironmaster.

The above is one of the best of the South Staffordshire Thick Coal Collieries.

It is fresh, fully developed, and the minimum profit, after providing for the redemption of the entire capital, are estimated at more than double the amount required to pay the preference dividend.

Prospectuses may be obtained on application at the Offices of the Company, 50 Ann Street, Birmingham, and from the Auditors of the Company, Messrs. JAMES & EDWARDS, Tokenhouse Yard, London.

The Subscription List will close on Saturday, October 31.

THE AGRA BANK, Limited.—Established in 1833.

CAPITAL, £1,000,000.

HEAD OFFICE—NICHOLAS LANE, LOMBARD STREET, LONDON.

BRANCHES in Edinburgh, Calcutta, Bombay, Madras, Kurrachee, Agra, Lahore, Shanghai, Hong Kong.

Current Accounts are kept at the Head Office on the Terms customary with London Bankers, and Interest allowed when the Credit Balance does not fall below £100.

Deposits received for fixed periods on the following terms, viz.

At 5 per cent. per ann., subject to 12 months' Notice of Withdrawal.

For shorter periods Deposits will be received on terms to be agreed upon.

Bills issued at the current exchange of the day on any of the Branches of the Bank, free of extra charge; and Approved Bills purchased or sent for collection.

Sales and Purchases effected in British and Foreign Securities, in East India Stock and Loans, and the safe custody of the same undertaken.

Interest drawn, and Army, Navy, and Civil Pay and Pensions realized.

Every other description of Banking Business and Money Agency, British and Indian, transacted.

J. THOMSON, Chairman.

EQUITABLE LIFE ASSURANCE SOCIETY. Established 1782.

MANSHION-HOUSE STREET, LONDON.

Directors. Right Hon. Lord TREDEGAR, President.

John Charles Burgoyne, Esq., Lord George Cavendish, M.P., Sir Frederick Pollock, Bart., Vice-President.

William Currey, Esq., Samuel Edwards, Esq., George Sovell, Esq., John Cogswell, Esq., John Harvey, Esq., James Spicer, Esq., Vice-President.

Samuel Hoare, Esq., John Kemp Welch, Esq., John Aldin Moore, Esq., George Frederick White, Esq.

Ex-Directors. Frederick Cowper, Esq., Sir Walter Charles James, Bart., William Edwards, Esq., Richard Twining, Esq., John Walter, Esq., M.P.

The EQUITABLE is the oldest Life Office on the Mutual System in the world.

It has never allowed Commission or employed Agents.

By non-payment of the ordinary minimum Commission of 3 per Cent., more than TWO MILLIONS STERLING have been saved to the Policy-holders.

FINANCIAL POSITION.

Present Cash Assets more than

Present Annual Revenue more than

Whole Working Expenses, about

All Policies taken out this year (1874) will participate in the next Division of Profits, which will take place on January 1, 1880.

The returns to the Board of Trade show that the aggregate working expenses of all the Life Offices in the United Kingdom give an average (including Commission, where paid) of more than 10 per Cent. on the sum of their gross incomes.

The whole Working Expenses of the EQUITABLE average about 22 per cent. on its Annual Income.

J. W. STEPHENSON, Actuary.

IMPERIAL FIRE INSURANCE COMPANY. Established 1803.

1 OLD BROAD STREET, E.C., and 16 & 17 PALL MALL, S.W.

CAPITAL, £1,500,000. PAID-UP and INVESTED, £700,000.

E. COZENS SMITH, General Manager.

LONDON and SOUTHWARK FIRE and LIFE INSURANCE. Chairman—HENRY ASTE, Esq.

CHIEF OFFICE—73 and 74 KING WILLIAM STREET, E.C.

LAW LIFE ASSURANCE SOCIETY, Fleet Street, London.

Invested assets on December 31, 1873

Income for the past year

Amount paid on death to December last

Forms of proposal, &c., will be sent on application at the Office.

EAGLE INSURANCE COMPANY. Established 1807. (For Lives only.)

79 PALL MALL, LONDON.

Premiums and Interest

Accumulated Funds

Also, a Subscribed Capital of more than

The Annual Report of the Company's state and progress. Prospectuses and Forms, may be had, or will be sent, post free, on application at the Office, or to any of the Company's agents.

GEORGE HUMPHREYS, Actuary and Secretary.